

THE INFALLIBILITY
OF THE ROMAN
CATHOLICK CHVRCH,
And Her Miracles defended against
Dr Stillingfleet's Cavils.

THE FIRST PART.

CHAP. I.

What moued the Author to write this short Treatise? How weakly Dr Stilling: trifles with his Adversaries; At ouch of the Drs new way in Arguing. Of his simple exception against the word Infallibility. How the Infallibility in the first Propounders of Faith depend's upon the present Guides of the Church?

In nine years are now past, since I set forth à book, intituled *Protestancy without Principles*, and after that another, called *Reason and Religion*. My chiefeſt aime and end in both, was to fix in all à firm beliefe of à Truth, which neither Doctor nor Diuel
A shall

The Drs
vast brag.

shall overthrow. It is the asserted *Infallibility of the Roman Catholick Church*, then largely discussed, with an express intention to oppose Dr Stillingsfleet. The Dr after à long silence replies, as you se, and pretend's to answer these two books. Moreover to perswade all, he hath answered home, hear how Champion like he beates the Air with à large siz'd Brag. When we (saith he in the Preface to his first Part P. 3.) *set our selves to Answer their books, we endeavour to state the Controversy plainly, to examin their proofs, to apply distinct Answers to their Arguments: we make use of no tricks to deceive men nor Sophistical Cavils to perplex things. We dare appeal to the judgement of any person, who will take the pains to examin the matters in difference between us. But they (Catholicks) seek to avoid the main things in Dispute &c.* Thus the Dr, and I am iure, never Paragraph had more empty *Nothings* cramm'd into it, than this of our glorious Antagonist.

2 Wherefore I deal Candidly, and must tell the naked truth (for truth will out) and prove it in the ensuing Discourse. This Dr neither states the Controversy right between us, nor examin's the proofs produced by me in behalfe of the Churches *Infallibility* but contrarywise waves the very best and most substantial reason I alledge. Again, he is

far from giving pertinent distinctions to my Arguments, that I verily believe by what hitherto appear's, he neither knows how, or where to distinguish. No. His strange new mode in Arguing, most opposit to all close reasoning, is, bluntly and blindly to lay about him with huffs and Cavils, light where they will, he heed's not. For as much as concern's his *tricks* and *Sophistry*, I will say in à word, they may (though far from being magical) perhaps ensnare some vulgar people, who decry all that relishes Popery, but to shock the judgement of any prudent man, very few, for ought I know, have found their brains troubled with them. At least hitherto, I never heard of one man, bred up in à right beliefe, gained to the Dr's opinions, by his *Sophistry*, *tricks*, or scribbling books.

3 Now to prove what is here briefly hinted at, and to show the Dr's rash and inconsiderate Answer, to be in real truth nothing like an Answer to my books, I will have writ this short Treatise, where I discover his shallowness in learning, and would, if possible, make him more wise, than vainly to boast of doing that which he neither has, nor can perform. He tell's us in his *General Preface*, What an excellent *chymical Controvertist* he is in drawing

why the
Author re-
turned this
Answer

off all the Spirit he could find in Reason and Religion, whereas it is evident and here demonstrated, he never meddles with that which is most material, and should be called the Spirit, though I urged him again and again, as you may see in the Preface, to answer for himselfe. So little of the Spirit have I met with in these two discourses of the Dr, that some may justly wonder, and perhaps mislike my pains taken in following too exactly his pitiful Cavils, while they plainly see, that the very most which looks there like substance hath been refuted in my two last Treatises, and so penurious he is in producing any thing new against me in these his discourses, that I could most easily have replied to all in one sheet of paper, but that would have gall'd Mr Dr and raised Clamours, as if I either could not, or would not answer him in his own way. To dead these false Alarms, I was necessitated to turn over much rubbish, to travel through the very most of his slight stuff, for want of better substance to work upon.

My intention purely good in order to the Dr, and Every one.

4 Courteous Reader, my intention is purely good to the Dr, in whom, if possible, I would work à meaner concept of himselfe, seeing plainly, the more he writes the more credit he loses, and

wh

why should we not, if we can take the man off, hinder him from incurring more disgrace, he hath enough of that already? In case my endeavour prove unsuccessful to the Dr, I doubt not, but that I shall unbeguile some over credulous People, whose opinion he courts, and would swell up with a high esteem of his parts. *Here lies his last aime.* To do this, I shall by Gods grace evince, that He err's grossly, in the main matters of Faith, want's learning, judgement, and common Civility. His defect in learning appear's most in this Treatise. His want of Judgement, Truth, and *Sincerity* will be more manifest in my second *Part*, where I rescue the glorious Miracles wrought in the Roman Catholick Church from a vast number of forgeries and Calumnies. His transgression against Civility is so notorious, that almost every page in his books, overcharged with it, cries shame upon him. Wherefore wonder not, if here and there I twitch him a little, though with no proportion to his rude and uncourteous handling me and others. Thus much noted, know courteous Reader, that,

5 The most or rather all, *Doctor Stillingfleet* hath against me in his first discourse, besides much ill language cast

out of that sanctified mouth to embellish his general Preface with, you have, at his 77. page. There lies the main business I am to consider, though all is so profoundly simple, that I am ashamed to read it. As for the scornful words he gives (no more regarded by me then the chartering of à magpie) I tell you plainly they shall never break my head nor vex my heart. Let that young Cock crow on his own dunghil, if it do him good, let him peck at what dead skull he pleases, no great hurt say I, while no more is done. My task is to look after substance, could I meet with it, but I am fob'd off with meer rattle tattle all along, with jeers and drollery, and therefore must deal ingenuously (courteous Reader) and openly profess before God and the world, that though I have with all possible diligence weighed the utmost strength of *Dr Still*: Arguments against our Church Doctrin, yet I find not one that carries with it so much as the face, or à shadow of difficulty, as shall by God's Assistance be proved in this short Treatise. And I easily believe, that those other worthy Authors the Doctor slights, and flurts at (all have their lashes) well able to answer for them selves, will manifestly make it out, that he only trifles, and speaks nothing

*Nothing
like à difficulty
proposed by the
Dr.*

nothing to the purpose against their learned labours My endeavour is to answer for my selfe. See more in the Preface to the Reader.

6 Doctor Still: in the page now cited pick's up a few of my Assertions taken out of the Book intituled. *Protestancy without principles*, and after his usual manner, proceed's very disingenuously; for he either mangles them as best served his turn, or wilily strip's them of all their proofs, which without any labour might have been added, and given vigour to every Proposition. Finally he wholly waves the ultimate reason I alledge for the Churches infallibility, *Protestancy without Princ*: P. 28. where I prove; that Christian Religion is ruin'd, if for ought any man can know, all Churches, all Pastors, and Guides teach Christ's Doctrin so fallibly, that it may be false.

7. Now à word or two of my Assertions, related by the Dr. I say first. *All true believers* (not all men as the Dr miscites) in the Assent given to Gods revealed verities are infallible, and prove the Assertion. God the first Verity reveal's infallibly eternal truths *for this end*, that all believe him as *he speak's*, if therefore he speaks infallibly, all that believe him as he speak's, believe infallibly. I ground

*Subjective
Infallibility
in true Be-
lievers.*

8

PART 1. c. 1. Of the

this Doctrin upon the Apostles words, 1. *Thessa : 2. v. 12. Therefore we thank God without intermission, because when ye received the word of God which you heard from us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is indeed the word of God, who works in you that believe.* Hence I infer'd. He that receives the delivered word of God, as it is truly *God's word*, and *not the word of man*; He in whom God work's belief by Divine grace, believes Gods revealed truths infallibly; And then Concluded. Whoever disown's such infallible Believers ioyntly disown's infallible Faith, and said, this reason proves à *subjective Infallibility* in true Believers. Thus the Blessed Apostles who received the word of God from Christ our Lord had Divine Faith, and firmly assented to Christ's sacred Doctrin, were *first infallible believers*, and afterward infallible Teachers also. What harme in these Assertions? I challenge the Dr to speak à probable word against them upon any known or owned Principle, for hitherto he hath returned no Answer.

8. I Assert. 2. P. 20. He that hear's an infallible Teacher hath the Spirit of truth, and he that hear's not an infallible Teacher wants the spirit of truth. Holy Scripture speaks as I speak *Iohn. 1. c. 4. v.*

6. vs

6. *We are of God, he that knowes God, hear's us, he that is not of God, beareth us not, hereby we know the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of error.* Hence I infer'd, that à fallible teaching of Christs Doctrin, which by the force of its proposal or delivery may deceive and be false, is lyable to cavils and disputes. In saying this, I wrong not in the least Christs infallible Doctrin, but only assert, that à fallible or false delivery which may easily deprave it, is not Christs infallible Doctrin, because as yet it is not made sufficiently Credible, nor ultimately applyed to à Hearer *as Christ's Doctrin.* An *Arian*, for example read's these words. *I and my Father are one*, and so also doth Dr St. Both read the Doctrin of Christ, yet contradict each other, and the one depraves and perverts it by his false and fallible delivery, I say this false and fallible teaching, most easily distinguish'd from revealed truths in Gods word, is not Christ's infallible Doctrin. If the Doctor boggle at this distinction whereof he takes no notice, the worst I wish him is, more light, and learning.

9. The Doctor saies I assert in my. 21. Page. *No man can be an Heretick that denies the obiective verities revealed in Gods word, unless he be sure that his Teacher reveals*

les those verities Infallibly. There is no
 such Proposition in that. 21. page, much
 less any words importing that a Teacher
reveal's. Teachers in this present state
 (good Dr)propole infallibly the ancient
 revealed Verities and often add à clearer
 explication which implies not (if we
 speak properly) any new Revelation. You
 have more of my Propositions in Dr St:
 which I own and wil defend as they stand
 with their reasons in my Book, even to
 the very last, P. 22. and. 24. where I say.
As long as the infallibility of à Revelation is
remote from me for want of an undoubted ap-
plication made by an Infallible Proponent, the
Revelation can no more convey certainty into
Faith, then fire at à great distance warm. I give
 this reason, omitted by the Dr. It little a-
 vail's to know, that God speak's infallibly
 (for every one has that assured) unless in
 the circumstance he speak's to me and for
 my salvation, I yeild my infallible assent
 to his word, which cannot be without as-
 surance had from the Proponent of Faith,
 that he Speaks as I ought to believe, in-
 fallibly If therefore the Proponent saies
 only doubtfully. *I think God speak's as I*
teach, but am not certain, the Assent given to
 his teaching is only doubtful. If he truly
 say. I teach infallibly what God reveal's,
 the Assent in à faithfull Believer answer's,
 and

and is infallible. See more hereof in the pages now cited; all waved by the Dr.

10. P. 79. Having slightly run over my assertions, the man begins to bristle up. This *saieth he is the sum of the Principles of that Metaphysical wit.* Hold there good Doctor. In the 28. page. n. 9. wholly omitted by you, I give a better Sum, and tell you that none can teach Christian Doctrine who truly ownes not God, an Infinite, verity, the Author of it, but he that only teaches fallible doctrine which may be false cannot truly own God, the Author, but some other fallible Proponent that may both deceive and be deceived. Whence I conclude, that God never sent Christ our Lord, nor Christ his Apostles, to teach a Christian Doctrine, *which by virtue of all the Principles it hath or can rely on, is meerly fallible and may be false.* Therefore some other malignant Spirit and not God, sent Sectaries to teach their supposed fallible and easily falsified Doctrine. Upon this ground, more amply explain'd in the place now quoted I rely, as on an invincible proof, and petition the Dr to return a close Answer, without trifling, needless parergons, vain distinctions, and yet lighter stuff, which ever take up the most room in his books, and weary a Readers patience. Se now how roughly he begins with me.

God never sent any to teach fallible Doctrine, which may be false.

11. *Sure*, saith the Dr (alluding to my Assertions) *à man must have his brains well confounded by School Divinity, and hard words, before he can have common sense little enough, to think he understand's them.* For ought I ever yet saw in Dr St : writings, his brains are not too much burden'd with that dangerous learning, had he more of it, common sense (not easily lost by School Divinity) would have guided him to write more to the purpose. But stay, Courteous Reader, is this the Doctors new *mode* of confuting Propositions? First lamely to set them down, and then to rail at the Author? Would not his Doctors hip take it ill, think ye, should any one confute all his late books by saying barely, his brains were so turned and confounded with Heretical fancies that in real truth he knew not what he wrot? What was it that gall'd him? How could he wrest any thing said by me to the least offence? I set down plainly my Assertions, and he answers not one, but becomes peevish, 'surly, and outrageous. Is this à Christian way of writing Controversies? If he thought my Assertions deserved not à scratch of his pen, why did he meddle with them, and allow them so much room as to fill two pages in his book? And if he judged them worthy

*The Drs
new way in
answering.*

worthy to appear there, why has he not replied to some of them? Hear the Doctors excuse.

12. *I never loved, saith he, to spend time* How peevish and blunt the Dr is,
in confuting à man who thinks himselfe the
wiser, for speaking things which neither he nor
any one els understand's. Can any thing be more blunt? What if I cheer up into some briskness and tell him, wiser than he, far more grave and learned, have without rubbing their foreheads, easily understood all that he flights? What if I add, it is à hard matter for one who has been long in Schools, to deal with à half Scholar, unacquainted with speculative learning? (Though what great speculation have we in any one of my Assertions?) Such men as these, when their brains reach only to à vulgar notion of things, think all amiss, if you follow them not just in their old hackney pace, or say any thing, though never so little, above their Ken. In case the Dr account me uncivil for touching his talent in learning, let him thank himselfe, who first began the quarel.

13, Next he run's God knowes whether, and saies he rather chose to put together such Propositions as might give account of Christian Faith without all this *Jargon* of infallibility, And, as I take

it,

His unrea-
sonable Cavil.

it, he relates to the Principles which slip from his pen in one hour or other when his head turn'd round, and are yet to be seen at the end of that pitiful Book concerning the Idolatry practized by the Church of Rome. If so; good Dr, follow friendly Counsel, and as you tender your credit talk no more of those Principles, for they are not only torn in pieces by four at least of your Adversaries, but moreover to my certain knowledge are scorned by some of your own learned coat, who look on them as the most senceless things you ever writ, next to your late infamous piece of *Idolatry*. But in passing, what shall we say to his *Jargon about infallibility*? Is not I beseech you, *Jargon*, à far more obscure Term; then the word *Infallibility*? Yet the Dr Complains's of *hard words*. Few I think of the vulgar know that *Jargon* signifies fustian language, pedlers French, or à barbarous jangling, yet all have à clearer notion of the word *Infallibility*, and doth not Mr Dr apply it à hundred times over in his Account, to God, to Christ our Lord, and to the Apostles, who were all infallible in what they taught the world? Now if he hold it not rightly applied when we speak of the Church, he is to impugn that by reason, and not to quarel with à harmless word as if witchery lay in it.

14 Soon

14 Soon after this raillery, he tells us, he will fix the Notion of *Infallibility* for saith he, *as it is used*, it seem's a rare word *How, and to what Infal-* for jugglers in *Divinity* to play tricks with. *libility is* For *rightly ap-* sometimes they apply it to the object that is be- *plied?* lieved. He mean's (or it's Nonsense) to all that God reveal's and call that *Infallibly true*. Very well done I think, for so that word of *Faith* which S. Paul preached Rom. 10. 8. with testifying to Jewes and Gentils *Faith in our Lord Iesus Christ*, was Acts. 20 21. objectively taken, *infallibly true*. Doth the Apostle juggle here? O, but sometimes they apply it to the subject capable of believing, and say all persons ought to be certain, that what they believe is *infallible true*. Most undoubted also; if they believe what God speak's. Let all the house of Israel most certainly know that God hath made him Lord. Acts 2. 36. I know whom I have believed and am certain. 2. Tim. 1. 12. And to show how firm and *Infallible Divine Faith* is in the hearts of true Believers, the Apostle tell's the Galatians 1. 8. *Although we, or an Angel from heaven preach to you otherwise then that we preached to you, let him be accursed*. Thus Scripture speak's of *Divine Faith*, and attributes certainty to it. What jugling lies here? Sometimes they apply it to the means of conveying that *infallible Truth* to the faculties of men,
and

and these, they say, must be infallible. Very right, no Jugling yet. The Galatians c. 1. 24. accounted S. Paul no Jugler, when they glorified God because one that in time past had been à Persecutor, now preached and conveyed the truths of Jesus Christ to the world. Again, if Faith comes by hearing, and none can hear without a Preacher. Rom. 10. 14. And if God hath appointed Pastors and Doctors for the work of the Ministerie, to the end *we be not carried a way with every wind of Doctrine by the deceit of men.* Ephes. 4. 12. If these Assertions I say be true, we are secured by Divine Scripture without jugling, that God will ever provide his Church of infallible Teachers, who by special assistance are to convey and propose to us *infallibly*, what is infallibly revealed, chiefly then, when the Mysteries of Faith transcend all natural reason, or lye obscurely in Gods written word. But of this particular whereat the Doctor boggles most, more hereafter. In the mean while you see that if Catholick Divines who apply infallibility to Gods *Revelation*, to the Faith of such as assent to *that Revelation*, and finally to the Oracle that proposes Faith be à jugling, Scripture it selve juggles with us.

15 Our Dr proceed's. *But the subtilty*
of

of these things (he means of the distinctions hitherto given) lies only in their obscurity, and the Schoolman is spoiled, when his talk is brought out of the clouds to common sense. In good sober earnest, Schoolmen will never be spoiled by such a Bungler as the Dr is. But wil you hear how Eagle like he mount's the clouds, and at once profoundly dives into the depth of this doubtful Term, *Infallibility*, if yet it signifies any thing. *Infallible*, is that, saith the Dr, which cannot be deceived. Now we are to suppose ourselves brought down out of the cloudes. Most pitiful. What cobler is there in England that by meer hearing the word *Infallibility*, understand's not as well the sence of it, as he doth after the Doctors ill worded definition? In God's name, how doth his definition charm greater clarity into the word *Infallible*, than it had before? Again, was *Infallibility* when I used it, pedlers french, and fustian language? How happen's it now after the Doctor's mouth hath hallowed the Term, to become à less *Iargon*? Or, doth he only tell us by his definition what à *Iargon* or fustian language signifies? We only ask here, whether the very word deserves contempt, and shall enquire afterward to whom it is applied? Lastly the Dr is Shamefully out,

B

for

The Drs ill
worded De-
finition
rejected.

for the Infallibility proper to Divine Faith is ill expressed by Saying barely. *It cannot be deceived*, much more is required, And it is, that as the true Proponent of Faith (whether Christ, Apostle, or Church) can neither deceive nor be deceived, So à true Believer, by *Virtue of his Faith*, can neither deceive nor be deceived. The Dr has not yet done. *If no one* (thus he speak's) *will say that à Proposition cannot be deceived, it is absur'd to say, that it is Infallibly true. A Proposition deceived, good* Dr. Propositions are not (if I understand English) properly said to be deceived, but the *Proponent* that makes them, when *fals*, is deceived, neither doe we say in Schools. *Propositio fallitur*, but, *est fallax*, aut *falsa*, & *Proponens fallitur*. But let this pass. The Dr's meaning may be à homely spun thing, and import this sense. If every one will say, that à Proposition may be false, it is absurd to say *it is infallibly true*. No hurt in this; no more harme can I discover in those other flat Propositions which follow. P. 82. viz. *That the impossibility of being deceived doth in truth belong only to an Infinitely perfect understanding, for what ever understanding is imperfect, is of it selfe lyable to errour and mistake.* 2. *Yet an understanding lyable to be deceived may not be deceived, and be sure it is not.* 3.

The

The assurance of not being deceived, is from Gods revealing any thing to men; for we know it is impossible that God should be deceived, or goe about To deceive man kind in what he obliges them to believe as true. 4. It is granted that what ever person speak's from God, he cannot be deceived in it, but men may be deceived in thinking they speak from God when they doe not. These I call loose and dull Propositions fit to fill paper, for to what other end they serve in this place, standing as they doe alone, and unconnected with the main Business now in hand, no man I think can tell me. Had the Dr come to the point, as he might have done well on this occasion, and proved closely by positive Arguments, that the Roman Catholick Church disperfed the whole world over is fallible, or that we are deceived in thinking God speak's infallibly by this Oracle (when he doth not) his propositions had been to the purpose. But both here and all along, he waves these exprefs positive proofs which should make directly against us, and only skirmishes with some few Arguments of Catholicks (God knowes most weakly) whereby they endeavour to evince the Churches Infallibility. Besides such faint attempts with flurts here and there at Popes and Councils, you have nothing, as shall appear hereafter.

The Drs
Propositions
to no purpose
in this place.

His error
concerning
private In-
spiration,
discovered.

16 The ensuing talk in the Dr's three next Pages, may be briefly reduced to three or four Assertions. Having told us that particular persons may be deceived in believing those inspired, who are not, he saith, nothing can be sufficient to prevent this, but Divine Revelation to every particular person, that God hath appointed infallible Guides in the Church, to assure men, he had at first settled his Church by persons that were infallible. What can the Dr mean? Will he say that God whispered every Primitive Christian in the ear, and declared by *private Revelation* when the Apostles preached, that they were his Infallible Oracles? Or supposing that the Roman Catholic Church be infallible, must God therefore communicate that secret by *private Revelation* to those many millions who have been and yet are professed members of it? What proof hath the Dr for this unmaintainable Assertion? In a word, thus much we have by express Revelation, *That the Church is the pillar and ground of truth. That he who hears the Church, hears Christ. That Pastors and Doctors will ever live in this great body and preserve it from the circumvention of errors, and these Revelations with many others of the like nature in Holy writ, are taught by the Church*

Church for this end, that every particular person after a due application made, may submissively yeild a most firm assent to them. This Assent proceeding from Divine grace, we call Supernatural Faith, and hold it infallible. Now, if the Dr will call these Verities recorded in Scripture *particular Revelations*, because they are ordained by Providence to ascertain every one in particular of what God speak's, no hurt at all, I easily accord, but his words and meaning *Seem* quite contrary, for first he will have all the Guides of the present Church inspired in their teaching as the Apostles were inspired (by some celestial vision or Divine illustration) Or, he thinks, they cannot teach Infallibly. Nay more. *Nothing* saith he. P. 82 *Can make the Faith of particular persons Infallible, but private Inspiration, which must resolve all Faith into Enthusiasm, and immediate Revelation.* Were this true, which the Dr never offer's to make out by any proof but his own fallible word, every private person might as securely write holy Scripture as any Prophet or Apostle, for the chiefest Prerogative granted these great Masters was, that the very words they wrote, expressed the internal inspiration of the Holy Ghost, or his private Revelation, and upon this ac-

count are rightly called Gods own words, When the inspiration was clear, they expressed it clearly, when obscure, obscurely, as we see in the dark Prophecies of the old Testament, and in the Book of the Apocalypse.

*The word
Assistance
used by Ca-
tholicks,*

17 Catholicks in lieu of the Doctors *Inspiration* and *Revelation* ordinarily use the word *Assistance* or *Guidance* of the Holy Ghost, which neither implies Enthusiasm, private Revelation, or Prophetical illumination, but the safe conduct and infallible direction of that Blessed Spirit, whereby the Guides of the Church are preserved from error in the substance of that Doctrine they oblige Christians to believe, whereof see more in my last Treatise, *Disc: 3. c. 12. n. 9.* To assert therefore as the Dr doth, that nothing can be more absurd than to say. *There are infallible Believers without infallible inspiration* is not only an unproved whimsy, but to speak in his homely language more then absurd, if he knowes what *Inspiration* properly import's.

18 P. 83. He saith first, that those persons whom God hath employed to make known his Doctrine, must give assurance that he hath secured them from mistake and error, and then add's. *But to suppose that we cannot believe the first Infallible Proponents*

ponents (he means the Apostles) unless there be such in every age, is to make more difficulties, and to answer none. And therefore he saith in the foregoing Page. *It is unconceivable, that persons should be more infallible in judging the Inspiration (read Assistance) of the present Guides, than of the first Founders of the Church. For then all my beliefs of the Infallibility of the first Proponents must depend on the evidence which the present Guides of the Church give of their Infallibility.*

19 This vulgar Objection solved over and over in my two last Treatises, contains nothing like a difficulty, and the Dr (who will not I hope disdain to be one of the Guides of the English Church) must confess it to be wholly strengthles, for when he preaches to his people in Holborn, and doctrinally explains that great Mystery of the Incarnation, or tells them (I suppose truly, though not infallibly) of an admirable Hypostatical union whereby two distinct natures, Divine and humane, are joyned together, subsisting in one Divine person, and in saying thus much gains belief from his Auditors, when this, I say, is done; One that's curious demands of those Hearers, upon what motive dare they ground their faith in believing so sublime a Mystery? It's answered, they believe it, because God

The Dr's objection, solved

an Eternal Verity deliver's the truth in Holy Scripture. But ask again, whether Scripture in exprefs *Terms* makes mention of that Hypostatical union, or of the two different Natures united together? They answer No; Yet tell you, that their Doctor to lay forth the Mystery more fully assures them all is true, and because he is *their Guide*, they no more suspend their Faith, but believe. Now, if in the third place you demand whether the Verity of this Mystery depend's upon the Dr's teaching, which is the only thing here stumbled at? They answer, no; for the Verity was proposed from Christs time, yet this influence his Teaching has over their Faith, that he both shewes what was anciently revealed, and now applies that ancient Doctrin to their weak capacities, not hitherto so exactly conceived, or laid forth.

20 Here you have something like that I would exprefs, and if the Dr were as infallible in his teaching, as we now suppose him to speak truth, we should soon agree. In a word. Catholick Faith as S. Thomas excellently well observes. *1 Part. q. 1. art. 8, ad. 2. necessarily relies upon the Revelation made to the ancient Prophets and Apostles, who wrote Divine Scripture*

Scripture, and yet more primarily upon Christ our Lord's teaching. Now as the Apostles often declared more fully what our great Master of truth infallibly delivered, and in this sense explain'd and compleated his Doctrin, so also the Church of Christ in all Ages since, declared more amply what both Christ and the Apostles taught concerning the Mysteries of Faith, and in this sense not only explain's what they taught, but proposes it also infallibly, as the certain Doctrin delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and upon this account is rightly called *Conditio applicans*, à necessary condition applying it to our capacities. Hence you see, though the ancient Truths were primarily matter of Faith, yet to Believers in succeeding Ages they stand, as it were, remote from all, and need this *immediate Proposal* of the Church living, and actually teaching.

21 The reason hereof, if you make à true Analysis of Faith, is clear. For ask why I believe the Incarnation? I answer, the first Guides of the Church revealed it in Scripture, but enquire again, what assurance have I of that Revelation which is not *ex terminis evident*, much less are all the particulars belonging to the Mystery already laid forth, evident,

I an

How the Infallibility of the first Proponents of Faith depends upon the Churches present Guides?

I answer the Attestation of the present Church manifested by supernatural wonders gives me my last assurance, and therefore either is à partial formal object of Faith, as I defend *Reason and Religion*, Disc. 3. c. 12. n. 8. 9. or at least an intrinsic necessary condition, as shall be afterward declared. Thus you see how, and in what manner, the believe of the Infallibility of the first Proponents depend's on the rational Evidence, which the present Guides of the Church give of those first Proponents Infallibility. The verity of the Mystery attested and considered in it selfe, depend's not upon the present Guides, for it was true before they taught, but à farther and more exact declaration of it, not discoverable before the Church speak's, and the immediate application of it respectively made to Believers, depend's on these now living Guides. And this also the Dr must confess, when by his preaching he *truly applies* the high mysteries of Faith to the understanding of his Hearers.

22 The Dr takes not his measures right in what followes. If men saith he, cannot be infallible in believing the Apostles unless there be other infallible Proponents in every Age, to assure them that the Apostles were inspired, why must

must not the Infallibility of these present Proponents be likewise so attested as well as the Apostles? He would, I think, ask in clearer terms, Why should not the Infallibility whereunto the now living Guides of the Church lay claim, be as well attested and applied by another Infallible Attestation as the Church attests or applies to us the Infallibility of the Apostles? And thus (as he insinuates) we must go on endlessly in these *Applications* and *Attestations*; or at last rest in that first Attestation or application made by the Apostles. Were it worth the while, it would be easy to show how the intangled Dr must solve his own difficulty, if in lieu of *Infallible*, you will use the word, *Truth*. He declares to his Hearers, and truly as we suppose, some dark Mystery of Faith, and with that you have his true *Attestation* or application of it. But must that Attestation ere Faith be truly conveyed into his Hearers be applied and attested by another Attestation distinct from Scripture and the Dr's own last delivery? If so, we go on endlessly in Attestations. In a word, the Answer most fully laid forth in my last Treatise, is thus. As when the Apostles preach't they rationally proved themselves by the signal wonders they wrought

to

*The Dr's
Simple Dis-
course Con-
cerning end-
less Attestations, refu-
ted.*

to be Gods own Infallible Proponents or Oracles, and therefore needed no further Attestation of their Infallibility in that Age, so the Church ever since, evidenced by the like visible lustre of rational marks and wonders, proves Her selfe Gods own Infallible Oracle, and therefore is without any further Attestation the *Primum Credibile* in order to Christians. But the first most immediate known Oracle made, by her selfe and for her selfe Credible (in so much that we cannot in this present state infallibly adhere to that the Dr calls *Apostolical evidence* or the Divinity of Scripture without the Churches Attestation) needs no further witness or attesting Authority. See more hereof. *Rea:* and *Relig: Disc:* 3. c. 12. n. 4. c. 15. n. 3. and c. 16. *per totum*, but chiefly. *Disc. 2. c. 11.* where it is proved, that as no Prophet was ever comparable to Christ our Lord, so no Church was, is, or shall be comparable to the Roman Catholick

23 By thus much here briefly hinted at, and amply proved in the places now quoted, you see the Dr knowes not what he saith. P. 84, where he tell's us, *If we rest not satisfied with the rational Evidence which the Apostles inspired by God gave the world, there will either be an end-*
less

less infallibility, or Faith at last must be resolved into Enthusiasm. Again let the world judge, saith he, whether Christ and his Apostles did not give stronger evidence that they were sent from God, *then the Guides of the present Church do?*

24 Because à lesse wary Reader may be here affrighted with big words, we will lead the Dr with his Bible to à Synagogue of Jewes, or to an Assembly of learned Heathens, and desire him to lay forth that stronger rational evidence, whereby these Aliens from Christ ought to be induced to believe that infallible Divine *Inspiration* imparted to the Apostles. If his answer be direct and pertinent, he will relate their Miracles. *The blind se, the lame walk, the dead rise &c.* And are these, say the Heathens, your best rational Evidences Mr Dr? Know, good Sr, that once (if true) they were Evidences to those who saw them, but now cease to be so to us, and therefore may be better called *matters revealed*, than *rational Evidences*. Now if the truth of that Revelation concerning the Apostolical Inspiration be only proved by Miracles not known or attested, but by à Revelation wholly as obscure as the thing is, which should

The Dr's supposed rational Evidence gives no Satisfaction to Jews and Heathens.

be proved by them, such Miracles far recede from the Nature of Evidence. Remember Dr your own words P. 110. *That a proof ought alwaies to be more evident than the thing proved by it,* but here the Miracles produced by you as à *Medium* to prove the Apostles Divine Inspiration, are wholly as obscure to the Heathens as that inspiration is they should prove, for both are only supposed, not yet proved Revelations, therefore they far recede from the nature of rational Evidence.

The Dr, to bring in Atheism, ruin's the true rational Evidences.

25 On the other side, could our Dr evince those Scripture Miracles upon the Attestation of a Church which God from the beginning of Christianity has gloriously marked out by as signal and sensible wonders as ever the Apostles were evidenced; could he make use of these later Signes and shew them to be no natural, but supernatural effects proceeding from an Infinit Power and wisdom, and only peculiar to the Roman Catholick Church; could he tell us he own's à Church which both Heaven and earth have so far approved, that never any known Orthodox Christian laid censure on it, or condemned its Doctrine; He might well give in strong evidence indeed, and powerfully plead against Jewes, Gentils, and all Heretiques, but the

the unfortunate man ruin's all this rational Evidence, and to his eternal disgrace, laies à charge of Idolatry upon this renowned Church, though by virtue of her glorious wonders She has drawn the very best, the most choise and learned of the Christian world to Her belief. And thus as I noted, *Reas: and Reli: Disc:* 3. c. 16. n. 28, He destroies Scripture, deads Faith, makes Christian Religion unreasonable, and doth his utmost to bring in Atheism. But of this more largely hereafter, when we shall discover the Dr's fraud and fallacy concerning his pretended Evidence.

26 P. 84 He end's with me. And in the next. 85. attaques that learned and laborious Author. *N. O.* His whole endeavor is to shew, we may have *Sufficient* certainty of Faith without the Infallibility of the Church. Though it would be incivility on my part to reply for *N. O.*, best able to answer for himselfe (neither can I, for I have not his book) yet by that erudite Authors leave, I will make à few reflections upon Dr Still: unknit rambling discourse, and evince that he speaks nothing against the Infallibility of our Church. This I doe, because I have not yet seen the Dr's second part, where I am told he hath much against me.

CHAP II.

C H A P. II.

A few Considerations premised concerning Infallibility. Express Scripture proves The Church Infallible. No one word for her Fallibility alleged by the Dr. An Argument proposed against the Doctor.

IT is prodigiously strange to see how uniuersally we Catholicks are dealt with, who, before these rambling Novelists began their new whimsy of reforming and deserted the old way of Truth, stood in a peaceable possession of this great *Verity*. *The Roman Catholick Church was, is, and ever shall be Infallible* in what She clearly obliges herchildren to believe. We then produced, and yet alledge as plain Scripture for the Assertion, as ever God inspired the first great Masters of the Gospel to write. We here publicly avouch, and will make it good, That God's word is as express and significant in behalfe of the Churches Infallibility, as for the most primary and fundamental Articles of Christian Religion. We confirm our Assertion by the unanswerable

*Catholicks
highly injured*

swerable Authority of ancient Fathers,
 and learned Councils, we add here unto
 the Authority of à Church never yet
 censured by any but known Hereticks.
 Upon these grounds we stand. Now
 hear I beseech you, how we are treated.
 There is à young hot Antagonist nam'd
Dr Still: who call's this claim to Infallibi-
 lity. *Page. 84. an unjust usurpation, à thing*
notoriously false, an arrogant pretence of an
usurping faction &c. Is it not, think ye, *The Dr*
 high time after such ratling language, to *called to an*
 give this Bragger à just challenge, to *account.*
 him to à rigid account before God and
 the world, and force him to prove what
 he saith? Scripture, Councils, and Fa-
 thers without glosses shall speak for us,
 these shall determine the cause, and end
 it. My evidences are as strong, as
 known. *1. Tim. 3. 16. That thou mai'st know*
how thou oughs't to converse in the house of
God, which is the Church of the living God,
the pillar and ground of truth. Matth. 2. 8.
20. Goe therefore teach all nations, Teaching
them to observe all things what ever I have
commanded you, and behold I am with you
all dayes to the end of the world. What
 Christ here promises, is certainly perfor-
 med, therefore his Protection over the
 Church will never fail. *John. 14. 15. I will*
pray the Father and he will give you another

Scripture
plain for the
Churches
Infallibility

comforter that may abide with you for ever, The Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive. The spirit of truth abiding with that Society of Christians it's promised to, is opposit to errour and fallhood. *Ephes. 4. 11.* We read of *Apostles, Prophets Euangelists, of Pastors and Docters*, given by God's special Providence to the consummation of *Saints, unto the work of the Ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ &c.* If you ask how long this incomparable blessing shal last? It's answered, *v. 13.* until we all meet in the unity of faith, and knowledge of the Son of God. Demand again, for what end those Guides are? *verse. 14.* return's this Answer. *That we be not like Children wavering, tossed to and fro, or carried about with every wind of doctrin by the deceit of men &c.* But if those Guides can be circumvented with errour, how is it possible to secure Christians committed to their charge from being carried away with the wind of false Doctrin? No Catholick, though he study for it, can speak more significantly of the Churches sence concerning the Infallibility of her Guides, then the blessed Apostle here amply expresseth. Thus much bricfly for an Essay of Scriptural proofs. Fathers and Councils shall follow on à fitter occasion, when the Doctor requires them.

2 In the mean while, this Dr who makes the Church and all her Guides fallible (for her Infallibility, saith he, is à thing notoriously false) is called on to confront these Authorities, and to prove his own Assertion by plain and express Scripture, or by so much as one Text that meanly and remotely hints at the fallibility of this great extended Body. Where, Sr, read we in holy Writ any thing tending to your sence, *That the Church is not the pillar and ground of truth?* Where have we, that God who promised to be with the Church to the end of the world, would desert Her in one Age or other? Where; That the Spirit of truth should leave this Oracle? Where find we (o horrid blasphemy) that all Her Guides, all the Pastors and Doctors grossly deceived themselves, may suffer millions of souls under their charge to be carried away with à whole deluge of errour, and one no lesse *then professed Idolatry?* Speake out Dr and produce your Scriptures, as plain for the Churches fallibility, as mine now alledged are for Her Infallibility.

Not one word in Scripture to prove her fallible.

3 Hence I argue. If the Infallibility of the Church be à notorious falshood, or as the Dr makes it in his Account, P. 101 ridiculous, yea really destructive to Christianity,

An Argu-
ment propo-
sed.

Stianity, Her Fallibility is à Notorious truth which mainly supports true Religion. But God certainly hath not omitted to register in holy *Writ* à truth so notorious, as mainly support's true Religion, therefore he hath not omitted to lay down in plain Terms the Churches Fallibility. But this most evidently is not done, wherefore I tell the D^r that not only he, but all the Doctors on earth, shall sooner lose their eyes, then find one single Text in the whole Bible which so much as seemingly makes the Church fallible, in what the obliges Christians to believe. But if this cannot be evinced by Scripture (laid as à foundation to the D^r's discourse) he may better goe to bed and sleep, than meddle any more with the *Question of Infallibility*, For all he saies or can say upon the Matter, will be meer empty talk, without proof and Principles.

4 I urge this Argument further, and ask. Whether to believe the fallibility of the Church be à fundamental Article of the Dr's new Faith, or only one of his Inferiour truths which Scripture expresses not, nor requires belief of, necessary to Salvation? Grant the first. He is obliged to prove it by God's express word, for as he thinks all fundamental

are there. Make. 2. this asserted *Fallibility* to be only one of his Inferiour truths wholly waved by Scripture, and not necessary to Salvation, the Dr spoil's his own Scriptureless cause. With what face then dare he tell us in his *Account* cited above, that our pretence to Infallibility *overthrows belief, destroys Christianity, and sends apace towards Atheism.* Whilst God never yet spake any such unheard Assertions, Never Church taught them, Never Fathers owned them, Never Councils defined them; only the disordered phansy of a young D^r begot them in Ignorance, and malice, as you se, hath set all forth in print. If I speak rashly, the Dr hath all liberty to shame me, and one single passage in God's word where- by this fallibility is proved, shall lay an eternal disgrace upon me: but as I am sure there is no such passage, so I fear not any the least disgrace.

5. What no such passage may one reply? Surely I mistake. For doth not Mr Still. in his *Account. Part. 1. c. 8.* of his plot page after page to prove the Church fallible, and by express Scripture also? I answer, he touches not the difficulty we here insist on, but juggles all along. We require one plain Text whereby the Christian

How the Dr
juggles in
his Account.

Church is proved fallible. And he gives this Title to his. 8. Chapter. *The Churches Infallibility not proved from Scripture*; whereas this or the like Title, could he have made it good, had bin to the purpose. *The Churches fallibility proved by Scripture*. That first Title only gives occasion (and he doth no more) to interpret and gloss such Scriptures as are usually alleged for the Churches Infallibility, but the second, would have obliged him to produce positive Scripture whereby that Oracle is proved fallible. This he waves and must wave, because there is no such Testimony in the whole Bible. You will say if the Dr makes it out that the Churches Infallibility is not proved by Scripture, He evinces He fallible. Very false Doctrine, for the Church was proved Infallible before Scripture appeared in the world, and yet is proved infallible independently of Scripture; But let this pass. How will the Dr make it out, that Scripture proves not the Churches Infallibility whilst I allege Testimonies as plain for this Catholick Tenet, as the Dr can produce for any fundamental Article of Christian Faith? For example Christ saies. *I am with you alwaies to the end of the world: The Comforter the Holy Ghost*

shall abide with you for ever. The words as fully express a continual assistance granted the Successors of the Apostles, and *that for ever*, as any Text in the whole Bible proves the Mystery of the Incarnation. Now all the Dr doth or can doe by way of Answer to these passages, is after his wonted fashion, to gloss them, as you may see in his *Account* P. chiefly 254. And cannot an Arian as nimbly gloss the strongest Text allegable for the Incarnation? (For example). *I and my Father are one*) as the Dr glosses this Text. *I am with you alwaies* &c. I yeild saith the Bishop cited in that page a continual Assistance granted the Apostles and their Successors in Christs promises, *but in a different degree. For it was of continual and Infallible Assistance to the Apostles, but to their Successors of Continual and fitting Assistance, yet not Infallible.* Mark the gloss, (no Scripture God knowes) and note likewise, how the Arian keep's him company. I grant, saith he, a unity or *Oneness* between the Father and Son not in nature or Essence but in love and affection only, and that's a fitting unity, the other in nature appear's unbeseeming God, yea Impossible.

6 Thus you have two fallible Glossers Dr: *Stil*: and Dr *Arian*, deliivering their

*The Dr and
an Arian
gloss scriptu-
re alike.*

their fallible sentiments. But how a poor Christian, who would fain learn what Christ hath infallibly taught, can be one whit the wiser by his hearing such men talk, is à riddle to me and every one besides, For I think there is none but can easily argue thus. That sitting Assistance maintained by you; Mr Dr; which excludes infallible assistance, is no more Gods express word, or the Doctrin of any Orthodox Church, than that sitting *unity* excluding à real unity, maintained by an Arian, is God's word or the Doctrin of any orthodox Church. Or if it be, produce your Scripture. What is it then? A conceited gloss which stand's unprincipled by it selfe. Observe I beseech you. We enquire whether the Church be not proved Infallible by the plain sence of Christs words now cited. *I am with you alwaies to the end of the world.* the Dr and his Bishop say no, because Her assistance is à *sitting one* but not Infallible. Here is their last proof, and 'tis no more but their own weak Assertion, that gives all the strength to the thing which should be proved, and consequently nothing like Christs Doctrin that ever stand's firm upon undubitable Principles. Nay more. That whole blundering discourse held on by the Dr

in

in his Account, P. 255. amount's to thus much only, that now and then he hint's at something which should be proved, but never proves it. And were he only once faulty in this dissatisfactory proceeding, it might pass, but I must say more to unbeguile those who read the D^r, and make this great truth known to all Viz. That when he handles these matters of Faith, and either opposes our Catholick Tenets, or goes about to establish his Protestantcy, the beginning, the progress, and end of his discourse, are naked and destitute of proofs. Neither Scripture, nor Church Authority speak in his behalfe, whence it is that Cavils, jeers, drollery and impertinent excursions take up the greatest room in his writings, glosses you have without end, but no Principled Doctrin to gloss for. How easy were it, had the D^r any thing like a good cause in hand, to prove his gloss of a *fitting but fallible Assistance* by Scripture, or Church Doctrin? But we need not feare, for I tell him when that's done, the Arian will advance his gloss as farr, and altogether as wisely, unhinge one prime Article of Christian faith.

CHAP. III.

CH A P. III.

Doctor Stillingfleets Rule and ground of faith , proved no Rule. It lessens not in the least the Churches Infallibility.

I **O**UR Dr by what I read in this first Part, chiefly build's his whole Religion upon the sufficiency of Scripture, easily understood in Necessaries by à *Faculty* that every man hath of discerning of truth and falshood, wherein he much cleaves to *Sotinianism*, and followes exactly the steps of Mr Chilingworth. Here and there he recurr's to Gods Grace and to other helps, but saies not plainly what those helps are, neither can he, while his whole endeavour is to exclude the Church from being the Rule or ground of Faith.

2 In behalfe of Scripture he laies down this Proposition. P. 99. *Although we cannot argue against any particular way of Revelation from the necessary Attributes of God, yet such à way of writing being made choice of by him, we may justly say, that it is repugnant to the nature of the designe and the Wisdom and Goodnes of God, to give Infallible assistance*

assistance to persons in writing his Will for the benefit of mankind, if these writings may not be understood by all persons who sincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all such things as are necessary for their Salvation. From this Principle he would conclude, that if those writings may be understood by all persons, its needles to rely on any Church (whether fallible or infallible) for our instruction in necessities, because Scripture alone without the Church is the *Master-Teacher*, and a faculty granted every man of discerning truth and falshood, which cannot but hit right upon these necessities, knows them all.

3 This Principle learnedly refuted by the Ingenious Author of *ERROR-Non-plus's*. P. 81. supposes what neither is proved nor ever shall be made probable. Viz. That an infinit Wisdom and Goodness hath made choise of à Bible only with this design, that his will be known in things necessary to salvation, which is no more but à vain Supposition: For if eternal Wisdom besides the *means* of written Scripture hath appointed another far easier, whereby his will may be known, and without which Scripture cannot be understood, it is only *supposed* and not *proved*, that every vulgar person, who

*Dr Still rule
of Faith
proved no
rule.*

who relies on his private judgement, is secured from error after à sincere endeavour to find his faith of all necessities in Scripture alone. And this I shall evince against the D^r by urging one Argument, proposed in my Two last Treatises.

7 Cast your thoughts seriously upon those vast multitudes who call themselves Christians, and observe how they stand divided or parted in Faith. Take these for example. The *Arians*, *Antitrinitarians*, the *Manicheans*, *Protestants* and *Papists* also. Most certainly all these together, neither believe nor defend the true Doctrin of Jesus Christ, for they hold plain contradictions, and this not only in lesser matters esteemed by the D^r unnecessary to Salvation, but in the most primary Articles of Christian Religion. Some deny Christ our Lord to be truly the high God, and Consubstantial with his eternal Father. Others to be truly Man. Some speak well of God's unity, but refuse to own à Trinity of persons. Others finally submissively yeild to these great Mysteries and hold them as undoubted revealed verities, the believe whereof is necessary to Salvation, after à due Proposal. Of such Articles I profess to speak, waveing at
pre-

present all others, if any be of lower concern, and now propose my Argument.

5 Christ our Lord who delights in no mans perdition, but *will's all to be saved, and come to the knowledge of his revealed truths.* 1. Tim. 2. 4. hath either pointed out à clear way, or given some obvious and certain means whereby these Christians that hold contradictions in the very Necessaries for Salvation, may be brought to à unity in Faith? Or contrarywise, hath not left any such easy way, or means. If not; Christ is à most uncharitable Saviour, who on the one side obliges us to believe the fundamental Necessaries, yet on the other, cast's all even the most learned upon an impossibility of ever finding them, for if the certain means whereby to find what we seek for, fails (as is now supposed) our enquiry after Necessaries, is meerly à lost and fruitless labour.

6 Doctor Still: who tells us, that God is not wanting in Necessaries to the Salvation of mankind, thinks, as you have heard, That Scripture pondered by every mans discerning faculty, without any other infallible Guide, is the best Teacher, the clearest light, and chiefeft means whereby all sincere Endeavourers may easily attain the knowledge of these Necessaries. First, the D^r makes here too

much hast, for he should on this occasion have given in an exact Catalogue of his *Necessaries*, these being of so high concern, that if one be mistaken, or left out of his catalogue which is absolutely Necessary, Faith falters, and Salvation depending on Necessary Faith, miscarries also. But our Dr was wise, and thought it best to sculk in Generalities for fear of being caught. To be brieft, let us suppose the beliefe of the Incarnation, that is of Christs being really *true God and true man*, may be deservedly called one of the grand Necessaries for Salvation. If the Dr boggle at this, I know well how to proceed with him. Thus much supposed.

My Assertion proved.

7 My Argument goes on. The Learned *Socinians*, the learned *Arians* with others, read and ponder the same Scripture you read Mr Dr. They want no more the Faculty of discerning between Truth and falshood then you. They pretend to have as much of Gods grace as you can pretend to, and are as loth to damn themselves by maintaining a wilful error against Scripture, as you. Yet this matter of fact is evident, That they plainly contradict you in the belief of Necessaries, and so doe other most learned Christians also. What redress now?

now? Where have we the means prescribed by Christ to make us all of one Faith in this one *Necessary* already Specified? Scripture you se abused, by you or the Arian breed's these dissentions, though none yet knowes by your Rule who is in fault, and therefore can be no fitt means to end them, for the sence of it in the matter now proposed, is the only thing in controversy. This ground failing, all sincere endeavour to learn what that book teaches without more help, fail's also.

8 Because the Drs Faith is as much unknown to me as his person, (by some hints I guess it to be à very odd one) I will press my Argument farther, and demand. Whether, if à learned Arian, after an exact perusal of Scripture, makes this sincere judgement by his discerning Faculty, that the high Godhead of Christ is neither revealed in that book nor worthy believe, he may boldly abiure Christ, *God and man*, and yet be saved? In like manner I ask, whether, à learned Protestant, if after à serious reading he judges that Christ is truly God and believes quite contrary to the Arian, may be saved also? In case the Dr say, all these, though of à most opposite believe concerning *Necessaries* may attain Salvation (and I
vriily

*A difficulty
proposed con-
cerning ne-
cessaries.*

verily think his Principles carries him to that desperate concession) with what conscience can he oblige Christians under pain of damnation to believe Christs Godhead, as a revealed verity most necessary to Salvation? For in real truth it is not so, because men professing Christianity may be saved without that belief, and if Salvation may be had, though this *Mystery be with contempt rejected*, it follows, that nothing of Christian Doctrine can be judged more Necessary, and so the Turks belief of one God, will be Faith enough to save all. I might here add more, and tell you, that the ancient Church most injuriously censured the Arians as Heretiques liable to damnation, upon their denying Christ's Godhead, for that denial, in the supposition made, is not damnable.

9 Perhaps the D^r will say. Some only of these open Dissenters who hold contradictions in Necessaries are in the right way to Salvation, but others not, because his Rule is neglected, for some out of slothfulness or for want of God's grace, endeavour not sincerely to know the Scriptures meaning in such matters. If this be his reply, the difficulty proposed return's again as vigorously as ever. We therefore ask by what clear way or means

means (Christ most certainly hath afforded means) can a serious Seeker after Necessaries, discern between these sincere not erring Christians, and those others who err ? Unless these be easily distinguished, unlesse it be known to what particular Church those first belong, under what Pastors they live, what sure Guides they rely on ; And the second misled be likewise pointed out as perverse and negligent, an Enquirer after Necessaries may as well close with the *Arian* and believe as he believes, as ioyn with the most Orthodox *Christian* in the world. The reason hereof is evident, for to know only in a general way that some Christians have a right believe, and others not (while all of a different faith profess to believe right) can never bring any to this determinate iudgement. *These are sincere Believers, Those others easily pointed out, are not.* And without this particular distinguishing knowledge, *Necessaries* wholly out of our reach, are (as if they were not) useless and unprofitable ; An instance will give more light. One is assured that some craftily devise to take away his life, but after much Enquiry knows not in particular who it is ; for all profess the dearest friendship imaginable, (as all profess) themselves right in the

D

believe

None can
know by the
Drs rule
who are sin-
cere belie-
vers, who
not.

believe of *Necessaries*.) Can this man avoid the mischief intended, by virtue of à *general knowledge*, that some would destroy him? It is impossible. This is our very case M^r D^r. Either you or the Arian intend mischief to the Christian world. The one or other would bereave us of life, *Faith I mean Necessary* for Salvation, but by your Rule we know not particularly which of the Two goe about to ensnare us, both of you cannot be supposed invincibly ignorant in à matter of so great consequence. Say now by what means can à diligent Enquirer know in particular the man that intend's our ruin? Shall we put the Bible into both your hands and bid you clear the cause there? It is meer labour lost, you may wrangle till both be tired, and all tired that hear you, yet you are where you began in à Labyrinth, nothing is ended the way, nothing concluded. Wil you say the Arian wants Gods grace? He verily judges you want it more, and what is to be believed? Will you say the *learned Socinians* or *Arians* are invincibly ignorant concerning *Necessaries*? They will cast that foul aspersion upon you and your Party. And who knows what is true here? Will you accuse them of negligence in searching Scriptural

tures? They recriminate as boldly, and with good reason, for their books shew them more versed in Scripture than you, that being made their only study? But whether you or they rightly understand Scripture, is yet a secret not knowable by your Rule.

10 By what is said you see the disconsolate condition all zealous Seekers after truth are left in. The Guidance of an Infallible Church is set naught by. The necessary truths for salvation, cannot, as we have proved, be known by scripture only? The unnecessaries, say you, need not to be known, Therefore men may get to Heaven without faith and of either of Necessaries, or unnecessaries, that is, as I take it, without any faith at all.

11 You may see. 1. The force of my argument hitherto proposed by these interrogatories. Please to reflect a little. It is true, that Christ our Lord who will's us to be Saved hath afforded means both easy and certain, whereby *Necessaries* to Salvation may be known? It is true, that innumerable learned men of all sorts of different beliefs, after an exact search of Scripture are at high dissentions

*The force of
my Argu-
ment, yet
more illu-
strated.*

tions about these Necessaries? Is it true, that all these cannot be supposed voluntarily to damn themselves by impiously imposing a false sence on God's word? Is it true, that no few among these many, wrong the most supreme Verity, and believe what God never revealed? Is it true, that none can yet distinguish by Scripture alone or a private *discerning faculty*, who at this very day do this wrong, or Contrarywise are right in the believe of Necessaries? Is it true, that if every private man sufficiently taught by reading Scripture only, all recourse to our Spiritual Guide though appointed by Christ to instruct us, becomes useless and unprofitable? If these particulars already laid forth, manifestly proved, as I am sure they are Dr Still: Rule for the finding out Necessaries by Scripture and the sincere endeavour of private men, is not only a slight Error, but in a matter of great consequence intolerable, yea and dangerous upon this account, that it enlightens none in the search after Necessaries, but casts all upon an impossibility of finding what they seek for. Now we proceed to another Argument.

12. Admit Scripture were as plain as the Dr can wish, Admit also that

may be understood by all Christians, who sincerely endeavour to know its meaning in Necessaries. A great difficulty remain's concerning *Jewes and Gentils*. *Viz.* How such Aliens from Christ may be gained to believe the Necessaries we speak of? I ask therefore, hath Christ afforded means to reclaim these from error or no? If not, God contrary to the D^r's assertion is wanting in Necessaries, and consequently, no man can prudently labour for their conversion? If means be allowed, that most evidently cannot be Scripture. Perhaps the D^r will say his Rule above, belong's not to *Jewes and Heathens* but to Christians only. If this be his Answer, I shall by Gods assistance hereafter clearly shew, that, that rational Evidence for Christian Religion whereon the D^r relies, avail's just nothing to the Conversion of either Jewes or Heathens. Here I am to prove that Scripture is not the means. First because such men after their reading it, slight and contemn all that Christ and his Apostles taught, and one reason of their contempt, as a Jew lately observed, is grounded upon the horrid dissensions amongst Christians (thanks be to Luther and Calvin for them) concerning the canon and sence

Neither the D^r's rule, nor his rational Evidence avail's to the Conversion of Jewes and Gentils.

of Scripture. Who, said he, can move me to believe in Christ by Scripture, while some called Christians deny his Godhead, Others his humane nature, some say his body is really present under a wafer. Others deny that, and thus, forsooth, Scripture must prove both parts of the Contradiction? Again though Scripture were supposed clear in Necessaries, it is yet far enough from being *à selfe Evidence, as to the Divine Truth,* or the *infallibility*, or the plain sence of these Necessaries. Nay, who can know by Scripture which and how many these Necessaries are? For example, I think S. Iohn record's à Necessary, when he tells us. *The Word is made flesh*, yet by bare reading and pondering the words, cannot without more light peremptorily avouch, that they contain à Necessary for Salvation, or that they evidence to me *Divine infallible truth*, much less can I say the sence of them is as I judge, while these Christians so highly at contest about the sence, that they maintain open contradictions. And this opposition alone upheld by the judgements of private men very learned, makes the *Truth* and *Infallibility* of every Revelation à thing only doubtful, and conjectural. All this being undeniable,

13 I say first, if à true beliefe of the *Divine word made flesh* be à necessary for Salvation; and if the *Truth*, the *Infallibility*, or *sence of the Revelation* whereby the Mystery is attested lies dark, (yea impossible to be found out by Scripture alone) one of these two things inevitably follow. *Viz.* That the wise Providence of God hath either appointed some oracle distinct from Scripture to discover that yet concealed *Infallible truth* and *sence* also, or that Christ is wanting in Necessaries to Mankind. Now that not only *Truth* but an *Infallible Divine truth*, and the genuine *sence* of Gods Revelation are objects of faith when we believe Necessaries, is most undeniable, unless one will say that we believe *truths*, but abstract or regard not, whether they be *Divine* and *Infallible truths*, we believe the words of Scripture without their *sence* &c.

14 I say. 2. There is an Oracle appointed by God to declare the *Truth* the *Infallibility*, and *sence* of every revealed Necessary, and prove my Assertion. The end of Divine Revelation is to settle in all faithful minds à firm beliefe concerning the *Truth*, *Infallibility*, and *meaning* of every revealed Necessary (for why doth God reveal *truly and infallibly* but to beget in us true and *Infallible Faith*?)

*The necessity
of an Infalli-
ble living
Oracle.*

But Scripture it selfe evidences not this *Divine truth*, *Infallibility*, and *meaning*, nor tell's us which are *Necessaries*, therefore an Oracle appointed by God, is both impowred and obliged to declare these particulars *certainly* and *Infallibly*. I say *Infallibly*, for if it faulter but in one, or give us only weak Topicks and doubtfull probabilities, the end of God's Infallible Revelation is frustrated, and our Faith can be no more but wavering and uncertain, that is, no Faith at all. This Argument I urged against the Doctor, *Reas: and Religion. Disc. 2. c. 19. n. 2. 3.* But no answer from him yet.

15 I Argued 2. what ever Necessary for Salvation is proposed doubtfully and fallibly, may by *virtue of that proposal* be à fiction and false, But à Necessary *thus doubtfully proposed*, appeares not like to one of God's *infallible* revealed *Necessaries* (for what God reveal's is infallibly true) therefore as *doubtfully* proposed, it appeares à changeling only, à *fallible truth*, wholly unfit to support Divine Faith. Some will say it is yet in it selfe à Divine truth, though proposed fallibly. Who knowes that? If neither Scripture, nor Oracle distinct from Scripture, nor all the Doctors and Pastors on earth can infallibly avouch that S. John spake à
Divine

Divine Infallible Truth when he said. *The Word is made flesh*, much lesse can they ascertain any of the sence of these words, or evince that they contain à *Necessary* for Salvation. One may yet reply. The *Truth*, the *Infallibility* and *sence* of these words are morally certain, and faith of Necessaries requir's no more. To Answer, I suppose, that moral certainty as it is distinguished from *Infallible certainty* may in rigour be false, or if not; that moral, and Infallible certainty import the very same thing, or degree of certainty. Thus much supposed. I ask, when we affirm, that God has revealed the *Mystery of the Incarnation in Scripture*, do we say, he hath told us that Secret by à Revelation, which because only *morally certain*, may be false or à lye? Its blasphemy to judge so, for all that the first verity speaks, is most Infallibly certain.

16. Or contrarywise, do we say that Divine Faith terminated upon the Revelation, though likely to be true, is yet because only morally certain, possible to be false or à lye? Grant this, and it follows that, that high perfection of Infallibility *intrinsic* to Divine Revelation lies out of sight, and in order to Faith is, as if it were not, and therefore can have no Influence upon belicfe. The reason here-

*Infallible
and moral
Certainty
imply à dis-
ference.*

*A moral
certain
Faith which
may be false
is not Faith.*

hereof is manifest, for although we know if God Speak, he speak's infallibly, yet all the men on earth cannot know intallibly by Faith, or by any other act previous to faith, that his infallible Revelation engaged in this Mystery, assert's it, or is certainly in being, because the best and surest certainty men can attain in this life of any Revelation is only Moral and may be false, But such a knowledge determines none without fear and hesitancy to judge absolutely that God speaks *infallibly*, or that he speak's as becom's God, for our Salvation. By this short Discourse you see, it is in effect the very same to say. God reveal's not *infallibly* any one Necessary, *as to say*, we neither know nor can believe that he reveal's it *infallibly*. For what strength or virtue can that perfection of Infallibility impart to faith, if none can assent to it as *it is infallible*, or apply it to his intellectual Faculty, but only by a moral certain Faith, which may be false? Who ever desires more of this subject may peruse *Reas : and Relig : Disc : 2. c. 15.* Where I show that neither God, nor Christ (God and man) nor Apostle, nor Orthodox Church ever patronized a certainty in matters of Divine Faith which may be false, nor to my knowledge, did ever any Heretodox Christian

content

content themselves with it in such Tenets as they held Essential, or were with them matters of Belief. I proved. 2. n. 11. That none but Eternal Truth it selfe who is the first *Revealer*, the Apostles, and the Roman Catholick Church which proposes the high *Mysteries* of Faith, can give Infallible assurance of their being infallible Divine Truths.

17 Now this Church evidenced by Supernatural wonders, (neither Prophet or Apostle had ever greater) is the Infallible Oracle I have hitherto pointed at in general Terms only. Her *Conversions*, *Miracles*, and other publick *Signatures* of Gods infinit Power and *Wisdom* whereby she is proved God's Oracle, are particularly declared *Reas: and Relig: Disc: 3. c. 15.* And her Infallibility is amply evinced in three whole Chapters. *Disc: 2. c. 14. 15. 16.* But I know not how it fall's out, Dr Still: hath waved all my Arguments and not answered one.

18 After à full consideration had of what is proved in this one Chapter, all ingenuous Readers will, I think, conclude with me, that never wise man made such à foolish Choice or exchange of means for Salvation as this Dr hath done. Observe I beseech you. In stead of Infallible certainty terminated upon Gods Revelation, he
is

*The Drs
foolish Choi-
es, and ex-
change of
Principles.*

is so strait hearted, that nothing is allowed by him but à great moral probability which may be false. *In lieu* of an Infallible Church which plainly declares her Necessary Doctrin, he thrusts into our hands à Bible most certainly obscure, and in place of the Guides of the Church who are by Christ's ordination to teach, he substitutes his own fallible discerning Faculty, or the private Judgment of all the Illiterate persons in his Parish. These must read Scripture, gloss and interpret Scripture, and when that's done, all of them like Quakers, after some few humms and pauses, may believe what they think is true, but not one amongst them shall ever know this way, That God speak's in Scripture as he thinks and judges. Pray tell me. What if some of the Doctors own Auditors with their sincere and serious endeavour made concerning *Necessaries*, dissent from him? What if they undervalue his private discerning faculty, and prefer their own, quite opposite to his? May both he and they hold contradictions in the most essential Points of Faith, and be saved? If the D^r hath not such *Latitudinarians*, I am sure there are à world of them in England. Be it how you will, his Principle is not only unsound,

found, but pernicious also, and destructive to Christian faith, as is now proved.

19 You may here expect that I solve the Dr's Arguments alleged in behalfe of his Principle, or 13 Proposition, cited above, I shall briefly touch some few though its scarce worth the pains, for they fall of themselves to nothing by what is said already. The rest I leave to his learned Adversary. N. O. and could have wish'd to have seen in the Dr's two last little Books something that bear's the face of an Obiection against the Churches Infallibility, but he is wary and knows well to shuffle, when need is.

CH A P. IV.

Doctor Still: Arguments answered. His unintelligible jumbling discovered. A word briefly of the ground of the Churches Infallibility. The Churches Guides teach infallibly.

1 **T**HE Dr P. 100. demand's whether Christ our Lord and the Evangelists may not justly be charged with *not speaking the will of God plainly*, if those who heard them understood not
their

their Doctrin? I Answer first, in case of not understanding, they had infallible Teachers at hand for their further instruction and made use of them: you, good Dr, have none such. I Answer. 2. It import's little to our present purpose, whether they understood or no without more light, when Christ for example said. *I and my Father are one* while Christians both now, and in former Ages highly differ about the sence of that speech, and cannot certainly say, this is God's true meaning, or that the words are his without an Infallible Teacher. But what, may one reply, can we infer because some mistake the sence of Scripture, therefore all do so? No truly; but this Inference is good, if some mistake and others not, its Necessary to have the mistaken clearly distinguished from the sincere Believers, otherwise a Seeker after truth, may as well become an Arian as a sound orthodox Christian. The Question therefore is how, or by what means this severing the faithfull from the misled, wholly necessary for Salvation, may be exactly done without erring?

2 The Dr. P. 101: most tediously rambles on to no purpose at all. *Is not Christianity*, saith he, *therefore highly recommended*

commended to us in the *new* Testament, because of the perspicuity, wherein the Doctrines and Precepts thereof are delivered? And yet after this, cannot the most Necessary parts of it be understood by those who sincerely endeavour to understand them? To answer this meer nothing, it's enough to ask, What Christianity is commended to us for its clearness and perspicuity? Is it *Arianism*, *Nestorianism*, or *Protestantism*? It little, God knowes, avail's to know in *General* that some Christians are right in the believe of the Scriptures most necessary Part, while no man can say to what Church they belong, or who they are? 2. It is most evident, notwithstanding the Scriptures supposed perspicuity, that very learned grossly err in the prime Necessaries for Salvation, and doe all these clearly see the right meaning of it? Here the Dr is obliged to tell us, *who are the blind or missed*, and which he ever unluckily waves, how those he call's sincere Endeavourers may be distinguished from others supine and negligent? And they ought to be known in the Dr's Principles, for if the discerning Faculty in every man can easily find out the necessary truths for Salvation by reading Scripture,

Scripture, it may, I hope, more easily discover the open Professors of these truths, or that Christian Society where such truths are taught. 3. Suppose Scriptures were writ for this end to teach all Necessaries, how can the D^r prove, that the search after them is committed to every private man's erring changeable Faculty? Why not as well to the Pastors and Doctors of that Church, whereof private men are members? Now (and here arises an insuperable difficulty) what if these private men highly dissent from their Pastors concerning Necessaries (five or six for example in Holborn from D^r Still? Those deny Christs Godhead which he believes) Both produce Scriptures and sence them differently, who is to yeild in this contest, the D^r to his Hearers, or they to the D^r?

3 This difficulty the Doctors worthy Adversary proposes with reference to the Church Governours, and asks whether these may not be presumed to understand the Scriptures meaning in order to Necessaries, as well as ordinary Rusticks, and if these be supposed to use à sincere endeavour in their pondering Scripture, much more may we suppose it not wanting to the Guides of the Church. And are we not here again, faith.

faith. *N. O.* arrived at Church Infallibility? See the *D^r*'s first part, P. 138.

4 Never was man more intangled in hammering out a solution to any Argument than our *D^r* is here. First he wishes *N. O.* had kept to his own expressions and not forced in that term of *Infallibility*, then to divert the Reader with nothing, he repeats again his whole 13 Proposition, and because he well understands not what is meant by men being infallible in *Necessaries*, he makes it capable of three several senses. 1. *That men are infallible in judging of Necessaries to Salvation.* Or. 2. *That they are infallible in teaching others what are Necessaries to Salvation.* These two meanings, the *D^r* rejects, and yet approves a third. *Viz. Men are infallible in believing such things as are Necessary to Salvation. I. e. That such is the Goodness of God and the clearness of Scriptures, that no man who sincerely desires to know what is necessary to Salvation shall be deceived therein.* Yet more. *Though, saith he, I know no reason for using the term Infallibility thus applied, yet the thing in it'self I assert in that sense, And what now can be inferred from hence but that the Guides of the Church, supposing the same sincerity shall enjoy the same privilege?*

The D^r
*much intan-
gled, in Sol-
ving a dif-
ficulty*

5 If all this be not an unintelligible
E jumbling,

jumbling, I never read any. Pray reflect, *Men are infallible in believing such things as are Necessary for Salvation*, and yet are not infallible in judging of these Necessaries. How can they infallibly believe Necessaries and not infallibly judge of them by that very infallible assent they give to Necessaries? Again, They are infallible in believing Necessaries, but not infallible in teaching others the Necessaries to Salvation. What is this to say? Cannot men *commissioned to instruct* others, teach that infallibly which they believe infallibly? The Dr. believes infallibly the high God head in Christ, cannot he open his mouth and convey infallibly this Truth to others capable of *believing infallibly*, were he lawfully sent to Preach?

6 Now if by those obscure Terms, *What are Necessaries to Salvation*, he only mean, that none can tell *How many Necessaries are*, he speak's a truth in his own Principles, but nothing to the present purpose, for here we only enquire, whether the Guides of God's Church, are not impowred to deliver infallibly so much as *one particular Necessary which they believe infallibly*? No, saith the Dr, because Scripture is so clear in Necessaries, that no man who sincerely desires to know

know them, shall be deceived. I answer first. Were it ten times clearer, the perspicuity hinder's not these Guides from declaring infallibly what Scripture speaks infallibly? The most that can be inferred from hence (were all true as its false) is, that the Churches Guides need not to declare any thing; but that their declaration therefore ceases to be infallible, shall never be probably made out. I Answer. 2. The D^r grossly mistakes, for most evident experience teaches, that thousands and thousands called Christians are deceived, who sincerely desire to know what is Necessary to Salvation. Is it not manifest, as I said above, that the *Arians, Pelagians &c.* Or the D^r with his Partizans, run on in a false beliefe of Necessaries? This matter of fact supposed, the Question proposed above return's again. *What means hath Christ left whereby all may certainly know the deluded or erring Party?* And this proves the Scripture obscure, or not perspicuous in all Necessaries, unlesse the D^r infuses a clarity into it which no mans eyes ever yet saw but his own, and a few Sectaries with him. The next pretty whimsy is, that he knowes no reason for using the Term *Infallibility*, - yet i't be applyed to Infallible Believers

lievers of *Necessaries* he asserts it in that sense. Is not this right as it should be? He has no reason for using the Term, but great reason to use the thing signified by the term. Let this passe, the worst is yet to come.

7 The Guides of the Church, saith he, *P. 141.* Supposing the same sincerity, shall enjoy the same Priviledge with Rusticks: That is, they may believe Infallibly as Rusticks doe, yet none can *Teach Infallibly.* First, this Answers not my difficulty above, when I ask'd, if these Guides and the Illiterate under their charge ponder Scripture, and use all sincere endeavour to understand its meaning, yet mainly differ in the believe of *Necessaries*, what remedy in such a case? Is not our Dr obliged to propose some fair easy means whereby these Guides and people may be united in one faith, or at least to tell us, on which party (whether Pastors or People) the blame lies, to the end all may avoid them? Scripture most evidently makes not the blamable known, nor unit's all in one Faith. An infallible Church is rejected, the discerning Faculty of dissenting men run's, as we see, contrary wayes. Therefore all may believe, as they Judge, whether true or false, or suspend their believe untill Dr Still: laies down

down à better rule. To that other parr,
 I say, the Guides of the Church can teach
 infallibly the Necessaries they believe
 (and I still insist upon Necessaries only)
 The reason is given already. To believe
 the *Infallible Truth* of à Divine Revelation
 expressing à Necessary, is absolutely ne-
 cessary to Salvation; but this, neither
 Scripture it selfe, nor the discerning fa-
 culty of any fallible man can declare or
 make known; therefore the Guides of
 the Church impowred by Christ to
 instruct (*qui vos audit me audit*) are to
 declare the *Truth*, the *Infallible truth*,
and sence of every Revelation, relating
 to Necessaries. Now further. If this
 declaration be so fallible that it may
 be false, neither Jewes nor Gentils
 nor Christians, yet seeking after these
 main truths, can come to any acqui-
 escency. For what have they to lean
 upon in the least degree, Satisfactory?
 While fallible men agitate the cause,
 fallible Discourses carry it on, and falli-
 ble Principles are the only support of
 all that is, or can be controverted?
 Please to se this Argument further en-
 larged. *Reas: and Relig: Disc. 2. c. 16.*
n. 18. whereunto our good Dr return's
 no Answer.

*The reason,
 why the
 Guides of
 the Church
 teach
 infallibly.*

8 Next vouchsafe to cast an eye vpon his. 147 page, and consider how lamely he handles à matter of greatest importance. *We are, Saith Dr Still far from denying all reasonable and just Authority to be given to the Guides of the Church.* Very general talk. Perhaps that Authority must be only reasonable which he judges reasonable. But of what Church doth the Gentleman speak here? The Arians and Protestants have their dissenting Churches, will you have the Arians follow their Guides and the Protestants theirs? Herein he resolves nothing, but sometimes remit's us to the Primitive Church which breeds endless disputes, because we yet agree not, what that Church taught, nor shall ever learn, but by the voice and Tradition of the present Catholick Church. Have yet patience to hear the Dr. *We say that their Authority* (that is of the Guides of some Church, but God only knowes which it is) *not being absolute, is confined to some known rule.* O, this Rule would doe us noble service, but the mischief is, our shuffling Dr clap's it under lock and key, like à Jewell worth hiding. You have it by the name of *some known Rule* though no body yet knowes what it is, or where to find it. He cannot in this place mean Scripture,

for

for its sence is most unknown, and the bare letter, as we have seen, causes open hostility, no lesse between the Guides of the Church and refractory subjects, than amongst the Guides of two dissenting Churches. In à word, If Dr Still: shall please to lay down à plain certain rule, whereby all dissenting Christians may be brought to one true Faith, even in *Necessaries*, he will deserve immortal renown, and do more then all the Hereticks since Christs time have done. But to perform this his intrigues concerning *Some Rule* and no man knowes *what Rule*, can never doe his business, whereof more presently. Now listen well to the end of his Discourse. *Where there is à rule for them* (he mean's the Guides of the Church) *to proceed by, there is à rule for others to judge of their proceedings, and consequently, men must exercise their judgements about the matters they* (the Guides) *determin, whether they be agreeable to that rule or not?*

The Drs general talk of unknown rules, enlightens none.

9 Still we are put off with general words. One rule it seem's is allowed the Guides of the Church to proceed by, an other, if the Layity dissent, to judge of their Guides proceedings. Yet no man must know in particular what these Rules are. Is not all this tattle something and nothing; empty stuff without substance? But say on. What if

these two Imagined Rules breed everlasting jars between the *Guides*, and the *Guided*, who is to yeild, and to whom? Or rather we ask, what means hath Christ appointed to end these differences by? If he say no dissentions can arise either about *Necessaries* or any other matter of Faith in case his two yet unknown rules be followed. I answer it is impossible in the Dr's Principles to prescribe or to set down clearly any such Rules. I prove the Assertion.

10 Put case, that the Guides of two dissenting Churches, *Arians* for example and *Protestants*, contest about *Necessaries* for Salvation, or any other matter of Faith (the like is, if dissentions arise between the Guides of either Church, and lay men under their charge). All these jarring Spirits, 'as we now suppose, are fallible, and may err in what they judge concerning their own Tenets. Now if the supposed rules pitcht upon be as fallible, à like faulty, and as liable to error as these Contenders are, they can never rectify them, nor bring any to a settled union in Faith; But all the Rules assignable in the Doctors Principles (be they what you will) are thus faulty and fallible, therefore most unfit to set any man right in Faith, for a fallible crooked rule applied

applied to the fallible crooked judgments of others at high dissensions concerning believe, regulates no better than if the blind endeavour to lead the blind. Pray tell me, did you ever know wise Man, after his hearing two litigious persons at earnest contention about *Meum & tuum*, act the part of a Judge, by Saying. *My masters be gone, you are both wranglers.* Here you have the very case of all Hereticks laid open. I speak boldly, and am ready to defend my Assertion before the whole world. What ever Rule Dr Still: can make use of for the ending of differences between him and Arians (for example) what ever Judge he dare appeal to in this contest, can pronounce no other sentence but this. *Be gone you are all wranglers.* The wisest on earth is not able to say more to your never endless quarels. The reason *à Priori* of my Assertion and all hitherto said, is thus. The certain Rule which regulates Faith can neither be taken from any controverted passage in Holy Writ (for that only yeild's uncertainty) much lesse from the fallible and errable conceptions of those who believe contradictions ; Here is all the Dr *can pitch upon for his unknown rules.* Tradition fail's him, if all the Churches in the world

In the Drs Principles, no rule is assignable to end contentions.

world be fallible, and have actually erred, for who dare, even upon moral certainty, trust the Tradition of condemned Hereticks, or of an Idolatrous Church, as in the Dr's Opinion the Roman is? The Fathers are fallible, and all of them, or the very most, infected with Popery. The Doctrin of the Primitive Church in controverted matters afford's no certain indisputable rule. Long therefore may the Dr overlook his Note-books before he find a rule for the Church Guides to proceed by, and for others to judge of their proceeding.

II Perhaps, his, 266 page will give more light, where we are told, *That the supposition of Guides in Religion doth depend of some common Principles of Religion, that may be known to all, and that within the compass of these plain duties, lies the capacity of persons judging of their Guides, but if they carry them out of this beaten way, or tell them, they must put out their eyes to follow them the better, what reason can there be, that any should commit themselves to the absolute conduct of such unfaithfull Guides?* Once more, you have here the like dull, flegmatick, and general talk, you had just now, nothing particularized, nothing proved. And all is tacitely to countenance that
foul

foul illegal *Schism*, and *open rebellion* made against the Church, when à few desperate Novellists headed by two ungracious wretches, Luther and Calvin, condemned her of error, and this before no other Tribunal but themselves who were the Rebels. Here one common Principle of Religion (and à main one too) which obliges Christians to obey their lawful Superiours, was against all conscience shamefully violated. Here the beaten way wherein millions had walked peacefully to Heaven, became deserted, and in lieu of that, *Meanders*, *By-ways*, and intricate cross windings, were made choice of. Now the time was when people (sure blinde with too much light) went about to pull out the eyes of their own ancient Guides, and saw more then ever the world saw before these new eyes were set in their heads. We need not, Dr, to stand indenting with you for these truths, They are as clear as the Sunshine; But as you sowe, you may hope to reap, you have cast the seeds of dissention into our once most Catholick England, and I tell you before hand (look to it) you will find confusion at the haruest, and most likely sooner. In the mean while, I tell you again, there is not one true Principle within
the

the bounds of Christian Religion, that capacitates particular persons to judge their Guides proceedings, Name this Principle and I yeild up the whole cause. Answer if you can. And thus much of the D^rs Rules.

12 Other petty obiections I find in this first part scattered up and down scarce worth reflection. P. 109. His Adversary. N. O. quotes that Text of *S. Peter. Epist. 2. Chap. 3. 16.* where its said, *There are certain things in S. Pauls Epistles hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, as also the rest of Scriptures to their own perdition.* These things being certainly of consequence, if perdition followes the depravation, we ask what is become of D^r Still: discerning truth from falshood by Scripture only, and his discerning faculty? Hear his frivolous answer. *But doth S. Peter say that Scriptures are so hard that sober minds cannot learn therein, what is Necessary to Salvation?* Yes D^r, he saith it expressly, for some (say I beseech you who they are) pervert Scripture to their own perdition, that is to damnation. Now if you quibble about *Sober and devout minds*, the Arians will tell you, they are as sober and devout as you, therefore unless you plainly point out those you call

*A simp^{le}
Answer of
the Dr, re-
futed.*

call sober minded, you may be as well listed amongst the perverse as any other, accounted by you depraved or ill minded. Solve this difficulty if you can.

13 The Dr in his 144. P. cloyes us with other Testimonies of Scripture no more to any purpose, than if he had cited the first Chapter of *Exodus. Theſſal*: 1. 2. 12. *The people are to hold faſt that which is good.* Very true. But are they here commanded to hold faſt to what their private judgements tell's them, and not to adhere to Apostolical Doctrin, and the Spirit of the Catholick Church? *Acts*. 17. 12. *They ſearched Scripture dayly whether the things propoſed were ſo or not.* What wonder here, if after S. Paul's large diſcourſe concerning Chriſt never heard ſo fully before, they ſearch'd Scriptures and found all true he taught, having ſtill an Eye more to the Apoſtles expounding Scripture, than to their own private judgements? The other paſſages alleged, For example. *We muſt not believe every Spirit but try the Spirits &c. We muſt earneſtly contend for the Faith once delivered. We are to beware of falſe ſeducers &c.* have no weight for the Dr's intent, unleſſe he ſhew by Scripture that *this trial*, *this conſenſion*, and *warineſs* ought to be done by

by every mans private judgement only, without any other rule. O, but there is à stinging Text. *John. 7. 17.* where our Saviour expressly promises to those that do the will of God, *they shall know of his Doctrin, whether it be of God.* Very true. But how shall we discern those that do the will of God, from others that do it not? Are those the Doers of Gods will who reject their Guides, and follow their own Iudgement in matters they understand not? Answer Mr Dr.

14 In his 143. P (for I run up and down to find any thing like an Obligation) we are told that all who consider the excellency of Christian Religion cannot but give it preheminance before *Judaism* and *Mahometism*. Very true, Mr Dr: yet you touch not the difficulty, unlesse you tell us which Christian Religion amongst so many dissenting Sects, even in fundamentals, may be called the only true Christian Religion. If *Arianism*, or *Palagianism*, or *Protestantism*, damn men as deeply as *Judaism*, what matters it, if one profess *Judaism*? I assure you Doctor, I have heard some great men say, that if all who profess Christian Religion believed *fallible Doctrin* which may be false, they would not give à pin to chule, whether they were *Jews*,
Arians,

A fallible
Doctrin
which may
be false, de-
structive to
Faith.

Arians ; or Protestants. But why have not you in this place or through your whole large Account, set forth the Excellency of your Protestancy, and preferred that little late unknown thing, before all other Religion? Some cause there is of your deep silence, and I have not dissembled it in my Advertisement. You really know not what to say of it.

15 P. 132. We have this Proposition. *Infallibility in a body of men is as liable to doubts and disputes, as in those books from whence only they derive their infallibility.* Sr, if I well understand this some what dark Assertion, please to tell me. Were not the Apostles an Infallible body of men? And was not their Infallibility owned as clear from doubts and disputes, when God had evidenced them by clear visible Signes and Wonders to be his faithful Oracles, even before their writing Scripture? Or did they derive their Infallibility from the books they wrote? The true answer to these demands will be our Answer. The Church is as rationally proved an Infallible Oracle by her Illustrious signes and wonders (and appointed by God to teach) as ever any Apostle was, this I hold clearly evinced in my last Treatise Disc: 3. c. 15. n. 3. and c. 16. n. 5. If
you

*The true
Church
made discern-
nable, from
all false
Sects,*

you Mr Dr can except against my proofs, please to speak, for hitherto you have answered nothing. I shew also, *Prot: Without Princi: c. 8. n. 2. 3.* That God neither will, nor can, permit à false Religion to be more speciously illustrated by rational Signs, then his only true Religion is. Were this possible, he would (contrary to Truth and Goodness) oblige reason to embrace à false Religion. If therefore the only true and infallible Religion be manifestly discernable or made known by the lustre of Supernatural Motives from all false Sects, we have enough. For it is most evident that our ever marked and Signalized Catholick Religion, illustrated by Miracles, and approved by the publick judgement of the very best and most learned who have lived since the Creation of the world, is the undoubted true Religion, where we learn what Christ taught, and what Doctrin the Apostles preached. And thus Dr Still: imperfect discourse *P. 143* where he gives the preheminance to Christianity in general, above *Judaism, Mahometism &c.* is driven home to that one only Religion amongst Christians, which must save Souls.

16 We say: 2. That this evidenced Catholick Church proves her selfe infallible

lible Independently of Scripture, as the
 Apostles did before they wrote their sa-
 cred Books. It is true, after those wri-
 tings are proved Divine to us upon
 Church Authority, we Argue from them,
 and evince her Infallible, but this only is
 done upon the Supposition of that proof,
 and not before; For we say and make it
 out clearly in the Treatises now cited,
 That the Church being *the light of the*
world, and à City placed upon a conspi-
 cuous mountain, demonstrable as *S. Au-*
stin teaches by every mans finger, is the
Primum & indemonstrabile principium, the
 very first and indemonstrable principle
 proved by *it selfe* and *for it selfe* to be
 Gods Infallible Oracle, whereof more
 hereafter. Hence you se. 3. that as the
 Apostles neither proved nor derived their
 Infallibility from the Books they wrote,
 so we in the first place (if à true *Analy-*
sis be made) prove not the Churches In-
 fallibility from Scripture, but evince
 this truth upon other Principles as is
 now declared. But saith Dr Still. *It is*
against all just lawes of reasoning to make
use of the Churches Infallibility to prove Scrip-
tures by. Why so noble Dr? I am sure
 for the reasons already given, you will
 be forced to retract this inconsiderate
 Assertion. Do not you know first, that
 F the

And proved
 infallible
 without re-
 course to
 Scripture.

the bare letter of Scripture breed's endless divisions even in fundamentals, not only between man and man, as is evident by the jars you have with *Arians*, *Pelagians* &c. but also between God and man, while all your vehement contentions are driven at last to know, whether your discerning Faculty, or the *Arians* hit right vpon the meaning of what God speak's in Scripture, it being most certain that Verity it selfe approves not your open contradictions? Who can decide here but an Infallible Church? Do you not know. 2. That it is more then ridiculous to draw either Iew or Heathen to believe these contradictory Doctrines as Divine or reasonable, while neither you nor *Arians* can ascertain any, that what either of you teach is from God, or a truth *revealed by him*? Who ought or can speak here but the Church? Do you not see. 3. That the clearness of Church Doctrin (universally known to all, whether Orthodox or others) begeth faith more easily then Scripture, yet obscure and unsenced? Hence it is, as I noted in my last Treatise. *Disc: 2. c. 16. n. 11.* That few or none Question what this Oracle teaches, as *necessary*, for that's plain, yet there are endless debates about the *Scriptures meaning*, and this only is

Gods

Gods word, not intelligible in à hundred passages without the Churches interpretation. 4 As I noted also. The *Infallibility and Truth* of every Divine Revelation relating to Necessaries, so necessarily terminat's Divine Faith, that whoever believes and abstract's (as it were) from this double perfection intrinsic to what God speak's, *believes not, because God speak's, but upon some other fallible Motive?* Now none can ascertain any, that this or that particular Revelation is true and Infallible but an Infallible Church only. Therefore you err, Mr Dr in saying, that the Infallibility of the Church is as liable to doubts as that of Scriptures, if you speak as you must of the Scriptures genuine *Sence, Truth, and Infallibility.*

17 The Dr P. 113. proposes one of the rarest obiections, ever man (I think) yet heard of. *Had Christ, saith he, intended Infallibility as the foundation of Faith, how easily might all contentions in the world have been prevented, had he said. I do promise my Infallible spirit to the Guides of the Church in all Ages, to give the true sence of Scripture in all Controversies which shall arise amongst Christians &c.* Answ. I verily judge, Christ hath fully said thus much. *He that heares you, heares me. The Gates of Hell shall not prevaile against the Church.*

The Church decides many doubts, not decideable by 'Scripture.'

84 Part. 1. c. 4. *The Churches Guides,*
Pastors and Guides are given to the end, we be
not carried about with every wind of Do-
ctrin &c. But suppose Christ, or any
Evangelist had used your very expression,
how easily would you, Sr, have found a
pretty gloss for it, and told us, That such
a promise was, forsooth, only conditional, if
the Guides followed Scripture, or some
like whimsy, which phansy might have
suggested. Now tell me, seeing your in-
vention fall's so luckily upon new
coyn'd Promises, why have we not in
Scripture a promise suitable to your new
faith? Viz. I promise no other Spi-
rit to any but such an one, as may
serve for the moral certainty of believe,
which is fallible, and may be false?
Or rather thus. I doe promise that
who ever read's Scripture and under-
stand's it according to his private Judge-
ment, though he err's in matters of
Faith (yea even in Necessaries) is yet
in the way to Salvation and need's not
to consult any Guide for his better in-
struction. Thus contentions would have
been easily prevented, and licence
given every man to believe what he
pleased. Such promises as these would
have fitted you right, Mr Dr, but
there are none of them in God's word.

18 P. 150. He thinks to destroy the Evidence of sense, and consequently the Grounds of Religion, because we believe not that to be bread in the Holy Eucharist, which sense tell's us is so. Never ancient Church, nor Councils, nor Pastors nor Doctors, nor any Orthodox Christian pleaded thus for sense, for all unanimously believed that really not to be bread, which yet in outward appearance seems bread, as is demonstrated against the Dr. *Reas: and Religi: c. 12. 13.* Whereunto he never yet returned word of answer, though I solved this very Obiection to satisfy the Gentleman, and told him, that the immediate Object of sense is not the inward Substance of bread but colour or light with other accidents, and these remain after Consecration visible, and sensible as before. It is true, reason upon the Suggestion of sense would judge, what we se to be bread, were it not over-awed by a stronger Principle, which is Gods express Revelation. To this we submit, and our crime is that we prefer the words of eternal truth before weak reason, easily beguiled. Pray tell me had the Dr seen those two Angels who came to Lot Gen: 19 in

The obiect of sense not destroyed in the Holy Eucharist.

the shape of mortal men, had he eate with them at *Lots* table, would he not have thought them men like others living in Sodom? But had God then told him by an expresse Revelation, they were indeed Angels and not men (which verity is now known) he would, I hope, have believed God and yeilded up his reason to that Supream Verity. Thus we proceed in the beliefe of the blessed Sacrament, whereof se more *Reas: and Relig: Disc. 3. c. 18. n. 4.* I shall add hereafter other considerations little to the Dr. Comfort.

19 Page 151. The Dr. would faine know, whether there be not some points of Faith and parts of our duty so plain, that no Church Authority, determining contrary ought to be obeyed? I answer were any so plain, as few are in the very fundamentals of Faith, witness those great *Mysteries of the Trinity*, and the eternal Godhead of Christ) the Catholic Church cannot by reason of Gods special Assistance determin the contrary, or contradict it selfe in any universal doctrine and therefore that *Non-obedience* hinted at, is a Chimæra, or a thing not at all supposeable. It seem's our Dr. would have the not worshipping Images to be

one of his plain delivered points. A gross mistake, as his worthy, learned Adversary Doctor. T. G. whole works and Person I honour, pithily demonstrat's in his late excellent book. *Catholiks no Idolaters Part 1. chiefly c. 3. and 4.* Now because I mention this Reverend man, I cannot but reflect upon another intolerable mistake of Dr Still:

20 Dr T. G. said in his preface to the Reader. It is à known *Maxim That none can give to another that which he hath not himselfe.* If therefore the Church of Rome be guilty of Heresy, much more if guilty of Idolatry, it fall's under the Apostles Excommunication (*Gal. 1. 8.*) and so remains deprived of *lawful Authority* (mark the words) *to use and exercise the power of Orders, and consequently the Authority of Governing, preaching, and administering Sacraments, which those of the Church of England challenge to themselves as derived from the Church of Rome, can be no true and lawful jurisdiction, but usurped and Antichristian.* The plain and obvious sense is, He who has no jurisdiction but is deprived of it by the Churches Censures, cannot give it to another. Neither can he that has no *lawful Authority* to ordain, *lawfully* ordain any, or give Authority *lawfully* to ordain others. Now

*An other
gross error
of the Dr*

comes Dr Still: in his General Preface to ward off this blow, but never man did it less dexterously, and we must wholly attribute it to his little skill in fencing. He tell's us that the council of Trent pronounces Anathema against those that deny the *Validity* (*observe here also the word validity*) of the Sacrament administred by one in *mortal sin, in case he observes the Essentials of it*, and in this gross errour he run's on for nine or ten pages, Citing Author after Author to prove that the Sacrament of Order is *validly* given by one in mortal sin, or excommunicated. But what is all this to Dr. T. G's. Most true Assertion? *That none guilty of Idolatry or Heresy can give Jurisdiction to any of the Church of England* (which they must have from Catholick Bishops or wholly want it) or impower them to ordain others *lawfully*, when they are deprived of all *lawfull Authority* to use or exercise the power of Orders? Hence you se Dr Still: blindness, who argues from the *validity* of giving Orders to the *lawful giving them*, and from the no power of giving Jurisdiction (the chiefest thing aimed at by D. T. G.) to impart it to men in England, incapable of all Jurisdiction, *by reason of their Heresy*. Thus much by the By, the rest I leave

leave to Dr. T. G. best able to answer. Let us follow our Dr à little, not long I promise you.

21 In his. P. 174. (for I passe over all that old trash examined à hundred times over, concerning *Liberius*, the Bishops of Istria, *Pope vigilius*, and God knowes who besides, for none of these concern the Churches Infallibility, and are all thread-bare worn out difficulties) I come, I say, to the page now quoted, where we are told, that of five parts of the Christian world four of them (Viz. The Nestorians the Jacobites the Greek Church, and Protestants) are all agreed, That there is no Necessity of living in subiection to the Guides of the Roman Church, but they are all under their own Guides, which they do not question will direct them in the right way to Heaven.

22 I am apt to think, Mr Dr, you question it as little, for it seem's by this your odd expression and some other which follow, any thing true or false will serve the turn, and set men in the right way to Heaven. But say on I beseech you. Are these dissenting Christians to be listed among such as you call sincere En-deavourers, who cannot but know what is necessary to Salvation by the clearness of Scripture? If you affirm; none of them

*The Dr
seem's to
patronize the
Guides,
among
known and
Condemned
Heretiques.*

err in Necessaries or the Fundamentals of Faith, and consequently the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, and *Arians* are in a safe way to Salvation. Would to God, Sr, you would once declare your selfe plainly, that we may hereafter know of what belief you are in heart, of any, or none, or of *one as bad as none*? Now on the other side, if you number not these among your sincere Seekers, but account them misled and deceived, to what purpose do you produce such examples? Is it to tell us, because their Number is great, you would have them therefore thought of greater esteem, or more valuable, then the Catholick Church, whereof they were once members, and from which Church their first Guides (like you) ungraciously receded? This way of arguing will ruin Christian Religion, for Heathens, Turks, Jewes, and Atheists are far more numerous then these. O! say you. P. 143. Every man when come to years of understanding see's upon his own Judgement and reason, an Excellency in Christian Religion above Heathens Turks &c. This, Sr, is my Answer. Every man at such years, if he will open his eyes, cannot but see an incomparable greater lustre and Excellency manifest in the Catholick Church, as *Antiquity*,

Con-

Conversions, Miracles, than in all those other Societies, though called Christians, who abandon'd it. It is true they ran out of this Church, but left behind them Gods own Signatures, Marks, and Signs of true Christianity upon it still, these they could never rob us of, nor appropriate to themselves, and therefore (its Gods just judgement upon them) remain as they do, *obscure* and *conspicuous*. Perhaps the Dr intended by his instances to give some little countenance to his Protestancy. If so, I answer. This Protestancy has the worst luck of all other Sects in the world, its like another *Ismael*, as it stand's up against all called Christians, so all are against this Novelty, and discard it as Antichristian. Neither the *Greeks, Abyssins, or Nestorians* can endure it, whereof some of them scarce hold it à Christian Religion. Read Prince *Radzivil* in his *Ierofoly. Peregrin*: Antwerp print. 1614. P. 109. Wherefore I see no reason, why Protestants should *like* these men cut off from the Church or seek patronage from them, for all of them have their Altars, and own the Sacrifice of Masse, adore the consecrated Host, pray to Saints, and in à word are as great *Idolaters* as Papists, to whom our kind Dr with much

And Com-
pliments
show that
Condemn
Protestancy.

much difficulty grant's Salvation. Now why such men should be courted, complemented, or thought worthy to dis- countenance God's Church, is à riddle to every sound Christian. Yet more, There are evident contradictions main- tained among *Nestorians*, *Iacobits*, *Eusy- chians*, *Grecians*, and others, who pretend to believe Catholick verities. And here our difficulty proposed above recurr's again, concerning the plain obvious means left by Christ to bring all these to one unity in faith, and this the Dr shall never clear without liberty granted every one to believe what is fancied true, not what God has truly revealed. Judge whether this be à sound way, or no?

23 Page, 180. Our Dr appeal's to *the Doctrin and practice of the truly Catho- lick Church in matters of difference between Protestants, and the Church of Rome.* A piece of wise nonsense. Let him first tell us plainly where this truly Catholick Church was, distinct from the Roman, universal, and Catholick, before Luther's Schism, and we will stand to Her Judge- ment, but he must not fool us with empty words. Before hand, I tell him plainly there was no such Catholick Society in being, for all nameable, besides the pro- fessors of our ancient Church, were con- demned

*He appeals
to à Church
never in
being.*

demned Hereticks. Now if he run up to the Primitive Church acknowledged by all most Orthodox, let him say without fumbling, what Protestants hold essentially Necessary to Salvation, and then prove, that the Primitive Church taught so much Doctrin *and no more as Necessary*, and he will dispatch à great piece of work, but I assure him, he will sooner grow gray, than give satisfaction in this particular.

24 P. 196. Dr Still : saies, *the places of Scripture which are alledged for an infallible Judge (or Church) are the most doubtful and controverted of any.* Answ. The proof of this Assertion stand's only upon his own proofless word, and licences every Arian to make all the passages in Scripture relating to the most necessary fundamentals of Faith (*the high God head of Christ for example*) *doubtful and controverted.* For if the Dr by adding his sence and glosses to such passages as significantly expresse the Church to be an Infallible Judge, will have them after his labour idly spent, *doubtfull and controverted*; why may not an Arian by setting his sence and glosses upon the clearest Text in holy *VVrit* alledged in proof of *Christ's Godhead*, make those also doubtful and controverted? But here is not all.

I say

The Dr ar-
gues against
himself

I say in à word, if the Passages in Scripture usually produced for an infallible Judge (or the Churches infallibility) are to be accounted doubtful and controverted, much more ought those places which the Dr alledges to prove this Judge fallible (were there any such in Holy writ) to be esteemed in like manner, *doubtful and controverted*. Hence it followes, that the Dr is at à Non-plus or an end, of all his Arguments against the Church, while he plead's by Scripture only, for, *if none can raise from à doubtful or controverted Principle any Proof, rationally certain*; how will the Dr evince by Scripture only, that the Church is fallible, or impugn the Infallibility she layes claim to by this Scripture, which he saith, is both *doubtful and Controverted*?

25 Page 197 He enquires into the Necessity of an Infallible interpretation of the doubtful places in Scripture and here loses himselfe, for in my whole life I never saw such à far fetcht rambling discourse as he begins with. P. 197. which summed up amount's only to this, that you must either believe the Dr infallible in giving an account of the proceeding of the primitive Church in this matter, or remain as ignorant as you were before. For my part I dare not
trust

trust the Dr, for by what I have perused, he is horribly out of all sound Principles. Be it so or no, I am wholly unconcerned in this controversy, having hitherto only enquired after the means how to understand the sence of Scripture in such passages as relate to the *prime Necessaries of Salvation. The Godhead of Christ. A Trinity of distinct persons &c.* Now when the Dr gives satisfaction in these particulars, have at him for the rest, In the meantime I supersede the labour which might be spent, and leave that to the accurate review of his worthy Adversary N. O. Thus much of the Dr's first part. And t'is more then I was obliged to take notice of, but because I wanted à long time his second discourse, I chose rather for the little leisure allowed from my other employments, to make the few reflections you have already, than to be forgetful of my good friend Doctor Stillingfleet. Now we enter into his second Discourse.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Doctor Stillingfleets pretended Answer to E: VV's: Two books, Protestancy without Principles, and Reason and Religion, shew'd no Answer, but à meer shuffling, or palpable digression from the main point handled in those Treatises. How the Dr shifts off the only difficulty, wherein satisfaction is required?

I HERE are, as I conceive, two ways of answering à book. The one to follow an Adversary step by step, the other to reverse his Principles, or at least to solve such Arguments as the Author judges worth an Answer. If he judge amiss, or thinks weak arguments strong ones, à Respondent ought fairly to lay forth their want of strength, and shew wherein they are fallacious. The thing I chiefly aimed at in both Treatises was, as those know who read them, to vindicate the Infallibility of the Roman Catholick Church from the unjust censure of Sectaries, whether you take it as à large body spread the whole

whole world over, or consider its Representative in general approved Councils. Dr Stilling: as appear's by his Title undertakes to answer these books, but doth it after à new mode, or the strangest way I ever yet saw in any. He waves all my Arguments, which I judge, prove clearly the Churches *Infallibility*, and entertain's himselte with some few *By-matters*, little or nothing relating to this main difficulty.

2 You will perhaps better understand my meaning, if I briefly sum up the chief contents of this Doctors idley spent labour, in the second discourse from his 2. Chapter page 329 to page 433. Thus it is. First he enters into à serious matter with meer Drollery, and spiteful language. 2. He transcrib's some parcels of my Doctrin mangled, as he thought best for his own design, and leaves all as he found it, though here and there he featly intermingles some scoffes, thought by him pretty *less*s, and to make greater confusion, now you find him like à rat nibbling at one of my Treatises, now at the other, without method or order, and the whole strain of his writing is either to tell the Reader, what he saies without the least shadow of proof, which directly makes against the Churches *Infallibility*,

The chiefe Contents in the Drs second Discourse, briefly Collected,

or barely to relate what I assert for it, but replies not at all to the Arguments I chiefly insist upon, as will presently appear. It is true, about his page. 362. he would fain batter my Answers to two Objections taken out of his *Account*, which meerly touch upon à Scholastical point. (How weakly we shall see hereafter) but all this while not à word comes from him, which directly tend's to prove the Church fallible, nor can I find any of my Arguments solved. Yet this is the man, that in his Title-page pretend's to Answer my two books. 3. After some quarrels with the Supernaturality of Faith, and its obscure tendency, He slip's aside into another Scholastical point, concerning the Resolution of Faith, and because the matter of it selfe is hard (and made harder by his jumbling) he get's into à Labyrinth of his own making, called the *Rational Evidence of Christian Religion*. My chief endeavour shall be to wind him out of it, which would soon be done, were he better versed in speculative learning.

3 The Dr as I said now, some what waspish, layes aside much of his gravity, and begins with, *Ironies*, *Mockeries*, and *bitter language*, called by some *Iest earnest*, and discharges that rounder shot of *Toyes*,
Triffle,

Triffles, and *Fancies*, very thick upon me.
 Is not this hard proceeding? Methinks
 these men of the new Gospel are stran-
 gely priviledged to reproach, when the
 spirit moves. What à gallant lesson
 had he learn't us in the. 5. Page of his
 Preface to the former book: *Not to revile*
though he be reviled, and here, weak man,
 he breaks his purpose, forget's his lesson
 and reproaches boldly? And will you
 know why? Forsooth, he takes it ill
 that I joyned him in my Title-page with
Atheists, Jewes, Turks, and Sectaries. In
 real earnest, Mr Dr, though I said it not
 in plain terms, yet I thought you well
 deserved the place, but seing you resent
 my putting you after that rabble, you
 shall in my next book be upermost, and
 have à place before them all. But in
 God's name what unluckie Spirit light
 on you in that deep Exclamation? *O!*
what à pestilent Heretick is this Stillingfleet.
 Look to it Doctor. *Ridentem dicere ve-*
rum quid vetat? If you in raillery make
 your selfe heretick, and others judge you
 one of the worser sort I will pray for you,
 but can not clear you of the guilt before
 you deserve better. There is more of
 this rambling. He tell's me. If either
 of my books were thrown at his head,
 he would have enough to defend himself,

Of the Dr's
Ironies and
bitter Lan-
guage.

for they are very thick and heavy ; But how would he defend that precious Pate, were his voluminous *Account* thrown after them ? I am sure that's thicker, and heavier. *To my great comfort, saith he, I never yet saw two such bulky books, whose Substance might be brought into à less compass, or more full of Tautologies, and tedious repetitions.* A homely complement. I hope, Sr, you except your own bulkie *Account*, or ought in all reason to do so, for in my whole life I never read any thing more stuff't with empty words, and superabounding Tautologies. To be short, I dare wager ten to one, if ever you and I meet in Holborn, that for one Tautologie in mine, I will shew five in yours, with à pretty addition of new ones in these your two last Treatises. Now whereas you tell me, the whole substance of my books lies in this one word, *Infallibility*, Know, Sr, you get the worst here, for the whole substance of all you have said, or *can* say, confessedly lies in à far weaker word called, *Fallibility*. Here it seem's, the Dr is willing to leave off his long Tattle, *for fear of more Advertisements*. And is it possible, could that harmless and well meant *Advertisement* wherein nothing can be found offensive, stirr up thus much unruly passion in à Dr ? I know

know no remedy, yet hope the Preface to this Treatise, will à little calm it.

4 To end. He ierk's me once more, and will need's suppose that *Protestaney without Principles* was disposed of to better uses, than to be read, because forsooth he ^{More jerks yet.} never heard of one man in England, that read it over. A weak proof of à false supposition. Good Sr, are all truths conveyed to your ears, do not some miss their way thither? Be it how you will, *hear*, or *pretend not to hear*, most certainly that book was read by many, not only in England, but Ireland also. Nay more; all the Copies above six hundred (excepting some few seized on) were in à short time bought up, In so much, that à Gentleman of our Nation, offered three Crowns for one single Copy, yet could not after long enquiry meet with one. These truths known to the Printer and others, are sufficient to evert your false supposition, and your weak proof added to it.

5 And thus much of the Dr's Comical Introduction. If he thinks me too pert or pleasant with him, I answer. *Benedictus si certasset, audisset bene.* Had not à fermentation of blood transported him beyond all bounds of common civility, no ill word should have fallen from me, but when we find à vain Bragger gloriously cuthrown'd in à vast conceipt of himselfe,

The Dr's
vast conceipt
of himselfe.

as if all he treat's with, were despicable Mushromes, it is Charity, I think, not to sooth him up in his folly, but to tell him his own home, as S. Hierome once did an Adversary. *Quæ voluisti locutus, quæ non vis audire debes.* Time I hope may make the Dr wiser. Let us now goe on.

6 I said above Dr Still: answers not directly one Argument proposed by me for the Churches Infallibility. If I prove the Assertion it follows clearly, that either he understand's them and *will* not answer, because he finds them too strong for him: Or, 2, he cannot answer, because he penetrat's not their force. Grant the first, he is à meer cheat, and deludes the Reader with à seeming reply, which is none in substance. Say. 2. He understand's not the force of my Arguments, and cannot answer, he is unworthy to be dealt with, and ought in that measure to be despised, as he despises others.

The Dr answers not my arguments.

7 Now I prove my Assertion. I say as he relates, P. 331. That without an Infallible Church (he means in this present state as I often inculcate) there can be no certainty of Faith, and have established the Assertion upon these grounds. Neither the *Canon*, nor *Divinity*, nor the

Infallible truth, or sense of Scripture, even in points *Necessary to Salvation*, can be probably, much less certainly assured to any in this present state, but by the Authority of an *Infallible Church*. To this *not a word* of answer is, or can be returned by the Dr.

8 I Assert. 2. As the Dr cites, that the Roman Catholick Church only is God's *Infallible Oracle*, and prove it, *Reas. and Relig: D. 2. c. 14. n. 10. 11.* from Scripture, Fathers, and most pregnant reason. 1. If any Church be *infallible* it is the Roman Catholick, for all others disclaim the Guidance of an *Infallible living Oracle*. 2. As nothing can more discountenance the worth of true Christianity, than a *stedfast perswasion* of it's *fallibility*, or easily being false; So nothing can fix in us an *undubitable* believe of Christ's Doctrin, but an *Oracle* not lyable to error. 3. And chiefly, If no Church be *Infallible* to whose Authority Christians must submit, when dissensions arise concerning the Fundamentals of Faith, and the genuinence of Scripture, both *Jews* and *Heathens* may most justly despise Christian Religion, and scorn all our endeavours to make them of one Faith with us, upon this ground, That none can certainly say,

*Proofs for
the Churches
Infallibility.*

what Doctrin Christ our Lord or his Apostles taught the world. So it is, Mr Dr, our debates about the prime Articles of Faith (no satisfactory means to end them, but Topicks and fallible reasoning) are so many, that all taught Doctrin lies like an undecided *Process* in law still disputable, and therefore of no credit or estimation, unless an Infallible Church decide them, and bring Christians to acquiesce in one Faith. These Arguments and many more I proposed against the Doctor in the Discourse now cited, and all the Answer I have, is, that he set's down some mangled parcels of my Tenents, or barely tells me what I say. For example. I assert, *Protestancy without Princ.* Disc. 1. c. 2. That a Doctrin which by virtue of all the Principles it has, is meerly fallible and no more, may be false, but Christian Doctrin (say Sectaries) as it is taught by all Pastors is thus fallible, therefore it may be false: But God never Sent Christ our Lord, nor Christ his Apostles, or any, to teach Christian Doctrin that may be false, Ergo he sent none to teach meer fallible Doctrin. This Reason our Dr blindly hints at. P. 333. but leaves it without any Answer. And thus he run's on to his 339. P. where he tells me. *He hath laid together so many parcels of my rambling discourse,*

discourse, as were necessary in order to the examination of it. To the examination of it, Mr Dr! Not one word true. This had been material to shew my Arguments for the Churches infallibility unconcluding, (you touch not these), or at least to prove by some solid reasoning that the Church is fallible, this point you most shamefully shift off, and in the next page tell us, that the necessity of Divine grace is no way pertinent to our present purpose, the Question only being of an *external infallible Proponent in order to Faith*. Sir, what you make to your purpose I know not, nor much care. It was my duty and *pertinence*, when I undertook the full and adequate Resolution of Divine Faith, to lay down all the Principles it relies on, and a main one, is the internal assistance of Grace. Had I omitted to treat of an *external infallible Proponent*, you might have justly quarrell'd, but when that particular is largely handled through the five last chapters of the second Discourse (and not a word replied to any of my Arguments) your accusation is without either shame, or grace, most unjust.

9 From P. 340. to 362. the Dr gives me but little entertainment, save only to make a few reflections upon his too many Parergons, and one repeated over and over (yet the good man will be free from

*The Dr
flies from
the main
difficulty*

Tautologies) is, that the difficulty now in hand only concern's an external Proponent, such as the Church is. Shall we condescend to his humour, and debate that sole Question? I am content upon one condition, that he plainly solves this plain difficulty. If all the men in the world (as we now suppose) considered meerly as nature has framed them be fallible; If none of them have infallible assistance to teach the very fundamentals of faith infallibly, and, if notwithstanding God obliges all to believe his infallible revealed verities without mixture of error; If finally, we evidently see Christians at high Contradictions and of a different belief in such Necessaries, of no less concern then their eternal Salvation. I say, if all these particulars be undeniably manifest, either you, Mr Dr ought to assign some clear certain means whereby Christians may be brought to union in one true Faith, to profess and believe one and the same Doctrin of Jesus Christ, or you must leave all to believe as they list, or what pure fancy teaches. My Tenet is that none can doe this *but an Infallible Church*, nor so much as bring us to any *Unity* at all, were faith, as you make it, only morally certain.

*And leaves
all to believe
what they
list.*

10 P. 341 He demand's *where have I shew'd that the Supernatural Principles of Faith do never cooperate but where the Church infallibly proposes*, and thinks I never attempt this. He wrong's me exceedingly. *Se Reas and Relig. Disc. 2. c. 15.* There I prove at large, that Divine Faith in this present state requires no less an Infallible Oracle, then the belief of the Primitive Christians required Infallibility in the Apostles. As therefore the supernatural Principles of those first Believers never could operate, contrary to the Doctrin taught Infallibly by the Apostles, so they work not in true Believers now, but when they fall right upon the Infallible Doctrin taught by the Catholick Church. The reason hereof is clear. God cannot concur or incite any by Supernatural Principles to believe a falshood, The Revelation therefore which support's Divine Faith, must not be meerly *apparent*, but real and truly in being, for then only Divine Grace cooperat's with Faith, not otherwise. So true it is, that the Infallibility in our internal Assent of Faith, ever supposes and necessarily prerequisites Infallibility in the last ground thereof, which is God's veracity, as likewise in the immediate Proponent, I mean the Catholick

Catholick Church. But saies our Dr very wisely. *If the Infallible certainty of Faith depend's upon Divine concurrence, the Infallibility of Faith may be had without an Infallible Proponent.* A most pitiful reply. It seem's he cannot well understand how one act of Faith depend's upon two distinct Principles, yet the instance now given will enlighten him à little. Did not the Faith of the Primitive Christians depend upon the Apostles infallible teaching? None questions that. And had not Divine grace influence upon it also? Most undoubtedly certain. Ergo two different Principles, an Infallible Church and Divine Assistance necessarily support one act of Faith. The reason is clear. Faith is the Gift of God and therefore without the cooperation of Grace cannot be Divine or Supernatural, and without an Infallible Proponent no man certainly knowes what to believe. For who can say indubitably this is the sence of God's word, herein lies the *Truth* and *Infallibility* of à Revelation, if an Infallible Church be rejected? Hence it is that the Primitive Church while She condemned all ancient Hereticks, and established the contrary truths, never proceeded *doubtfully*, or *probably*, but spake as Gods Oracle ought

The necessa-
ry principles
for Faith

ought to speak, infallibly.

11 The Dr P. 342. Shewes himself à meer Rambler, multiplies words, and proves just nothing. First he tells me six or seven times over (yet he is far from tedious repetitions) if Faith depends on Grace, an external infallible Proponent seem's needless, Then he thinks I destroy my selfe, because I say the Infallible certainty of Faith comes from Gods *interiour illumination*, as it more lively set's forth the formal object assented to. What's next? Marry, he hath often heard *of the great Assistance Jesuits have in writing their books*, and Imagins that some Enemy hath put these things into my head. Sr, without doubt you have heard many à magnified untruth, and this, if it relate to any Assistance given me, is à loud one, as all who know me can testify, and will avouch, that I needed no assistance to answer an Adversary, so well tamed, and broken as you are. Now, if you will rely so much upon *Hearsay*, know, Sr, I have also heard something, and had it from men of good repute, and credit. It is, that the most able at Cambridge, with one likewise at Oxôrd, aided you to the purpose, in setting forth your tumbling *Accounts*, and I am apt to believe this true, because
some

some who know you, Conceive you not à man so expedite and nimble at work, as to dispatch such à volume in à twelvemonths time, though to gain applause, this must be insinuated in the first words of your preface. These things I have heard, whether all be true or no, you know best.

12 Soon after, to fill paper, you tell me again what I say, then that I shake hands with Calvin, and some old Enemies in this matter of Grace, that I hold you à Denier of Grace, and much more to little purpose. Concerning the Assistance of Grace in order to Faith, I say, that Faith being à *Gift of God* Necessarily depend's on à supernatural Principle, and this is Catholick Doctrin taken from Scripture, Church authority, and holy Fathers. What I hold particularly of its giving *more clarity to an obscure Revelation*, though only an opinion in Schools, (maintained by some, denied by others) is sounder Doctrin then your skill in Divinity can refute. You have it largely set down. *Reas. and Relig. Disc. 3. c. 9. n. chiefly 13.* Your wilful fouling me with Calvinism becomes one that knowes better to calumniate, than to argue. Had Calvin own'd the Church infallible as I do in all she obli-

ges

The Dr's
fouling me
with Calvi-
nism, shew'd
fences and
ridiculous.

ges Christians to believe, and dutifully submitted to her judgement; his Faith would have been right, and Grace answerable, Supernatural, but because he slighted that Oracle and believed what meer fancy suggested, he abused Grace, and had no true Faith. Should I, Sr, maintain à light of Faith allowed men at random, to believe what their private judgements tell them concerning Gods revelations in Scripture, independently of *all Infallible exterior Propounders of Faith*, I should not much differ from Calvin, but when I only assert it to serve for à better manifestation of such truths as an *Infallible Church delivers*, which are known without that light, *though by an inferior degree of certainty*, the Calvinism is more in your head, then in my Doctrin. To say more of this subiect, were only to transcribe what I have in the place now cited.

13 P. 347, to P. 361. I find the like bundle of trash all along. Now moral certainty refuted above comes in again. Now the Question in this Controversy is Stated à new. *Viz. Whether the Spirit of God may not by moral Arguments work in mens minds such à certain assent of Faith as* The Dr err's *the Scripture requires for Salvation.* Here in stating the question the Dr err's for the Question is not whether

whether Arguments morally certain may induce to believe, but whether Faith relying on moral inducements *only*, be Divine and Supernatural? This I deny. The next Question started P. 349. is, whether Supernatural Faith be at last resolved into God's Verity *known by natural reason*, which is only a Theological controversy, wholly impertinent to our present difficulty of the Churches Infallibility, or the undoubted certainty of Faith? Grant or deny, no hurt to either? My opinion is (and it is no more but an opinion) That Faith relies not upon that *veracity* as known *Scientifically*, though I am far from excluding the natural knowledge thereof, from our capacities, before we believe a Divine Revelation. But saith the Dr. Supposing God had never discovered his own Veracity in Scripture, could not men have had Divine Faith? Yea, and with the Assistance of Grace Supernatural Faith also of God, *as he is a Rewarder*. Heb: 11. 6, in case they had never heard of either Church, or Scripture? To such, God speak's by his visible and Admirable Providence over the world, *For his invisible perfections are manifested from the creation of the world*. Rom. 1. 19. *The Heavens declare his glory &c.* But what is all this

to our matter in hand, when we have Gods veracity, and Revelation proposed by Church and Scripture, and easily suppose that first perfection known by natural reason?

14 In the next place the Dr has à fling at *Cardinal Lugo. Suares*, with others, and court's them after his homely manner with icers and reproachful language. Poor man! Were these profound Doctors living, he would not be thought worthy to turn over books for them. Soon after he would have the terms of *Divine, Supernatural, Infallible*, and Inevident Faith banished Schools. That is, because he understand's them not. *Of the Dr's rambling a*

Next he tell's us. *P. 358. These things were necessary to be premised, before we could come to the true state of the Question*, and thus it is. *Whether in order to the certainty of our Faith concerning Gods Revelation, an Infallible Testimony of the Church be necessary.* This he proposes, and denies, yet never so much as offer's to meddle with the Question. What is done? Marry, *And intolerable Shuffling.*

he first makes another large excursion, and relates some broken pieces of my Doctrin, then shamefully slip's aside, and enters upon à meer speculative Scholastical difficulty, concerning the

H Resolution

Resolution of Faith. Is not this worse then shuffling. Suppose that neither Mr Dr nor I, give the best Resolution in this matter, doth it therefore follow that Faith requires not the Churches infallible Testimony *in this present state*. No more followes from this, (were all true) save thus much only, that neither of us as yet have hit right upon the true Resolution. In à word, the necessary dependence of Faith upon the Church, is proved in both my last Treatises, because none can have certainty of the Divine *Inspiration of Scriptures*, of the *Infallible* truth of Scriptures, or finally of their *genuin sense*, unless an Infallible Church ascertain these particulars, and to these convincing proofs (wholly independent of the Dr's Resolution, and mine) no answer was ever yet, nor can be hereafter returned.

15 The Dr told us just now, he would come to the true state of the Question concerning the Churches infallible Testimony, and to comply with his promise, as I said above, he meddles not at all with it, but. P. 361. attacks my Resolution of Faith, and doth it in such an unlearned manner, as never Dr I think, did before him. First he lays down à part of my Doctrine, but as
his

his custome is, answers nothing. 2. In
 lieu of answering, he object's, and tells
 us again an old story partly taken out
 of his *Account*. What proceeding is this?
 Our method is quite contrary, we ever
 solve an Argument directly when it is
 proposed, and should be laugh't at, did
 we to avoid the difficulty, only throw
 an another objection at an Adversary, to
 stop his mouth with.

16 A word now of my Doctrin, to
 the end all may se how this man deals
 with me. *Reas. and Relig. Disc. 1. c. 1.*
and. 6. I Assert. That as the primitive
 Christians resolved their Faith, just so
 we resolve ours, and argue thus. Had
 one demanded of those first converted
 multitudes after the Canon of Scripture
 was written, why they believed Christ
 to be the Son of God and Saviour of
 the world? They might have answered,
 Scripture, as we are taught, expresses
 these verities. But ask again, how know
 you, that your Scriptures are not sup-
 positious as some Gospels have been? They
 would have said (for we suppose them
 reasonable) this we believe upon the
 undoubted Testimony of those blef-
 sed men the Apostles who wrot that
 Holy book. Yet another Question en-
 sues. How do you know that these

*We now re-
 solve our
 Faith, as
 the primiti-
 ve Chri-
 stians did
 before us,*

Apostles were not Cheats, for there have been false Prophets and Apostles, but men inspired by Almighty God to teach, and write his sacred verities? Had they proved this by Scripture the Circle would have been inevitable. For to say *Scripture is Gods word because the Apostles tell us so,* and to say *the Apostles were infallible Oracles of truth, because the Scripture affirm's that,* implies a most vicious circulation. Their rational Answer therefore would have been, for there is no other. The manifest wonders done by the Apostles, their strange Miracles and Conversions wrought the whole world over, their eminent Sanctity and shedding of blood for the Doctrin delivered by them, proved those blessed men to be Oracle divinely inspired, Gods most faithful and Commissioned Teachers. But all this Discourse hold's exactly, applyed to the Roman Catholick Church, for She evidences the like undeniable Miracles, greater Conversions, more martyrdoms since the Apostles dayes, most admirable Sanctity in thousands and thousands, therefore She in like manner is proved God's Oracle, as is more largely declared in the place now cited.

17 This Argument I urged against the Dr, and told him c. 6. that he was either obliged to shew wherein those
 full

first Apostolical Miracles and Conversions surpass'd these latter of the Church, or rationally to blame my inference, as defective and unconcluding. *Viz. That the Church is not as fully evinced by her Signs to be God's Oracle, as the Apostles were by theirs.* You may read. c. 6. n. 5. how egregiously the Dr trifled with this difficulty in his *Account*, and here he is worse, though he had seen all my exceptions made against him in his Answer returned to T. C. Observe I beseech you.

18 *Against this*, saith the Dr (he means of paralleling the Churches Miracles, Conversions &c. with those of the Apostles) *I objected three things.* Object Mr. Dr! In this place you are not to object, but to Answer the main ground I rely on in my Resolution, that is to shew wherein the parity between the Apostolical Church, and ours fail's, or is faulty; or if that cannot be done, to admit of my *Inference.* You perform neither, but shamefully shift off what most presseth, and it is done most unluckily, for your objections contain nothing but what is directly replied to by me in the. 1. 2. and 3. Chap: of that .3. Discourse. You say first. This way of resolving Faith seem's vnreasonable, because an assent is hereby required beyond all degree of Evidence, no grounds being assign'd for it, but the

*The Dr in
stead of
answering,
object's
again what
had been
solved.*

motives of Credibility which are faillible. Here are three *errours at once*, plainly refuted in the Chapters now cited, where I say, our true Christian Faith in this present state no more goes beyond the proportion and degree of evidence (be yet this unexplicated evidence what you will) then the Faith of the Primitive Christians went beyond it. And I urg'd you again and again to giue a disparity, or to shew wherein the tendency of their Faith was different from ours. It is a flat calumny to say as you do, that, I assigne no other grounds for Faith but the motives of Credibility, which you suppose faillible. C. 2. n. 8. I say expressly, our Assent to matters of Faith is ultimatly groundd upon God's Divine Testimony, and not (*as Faith*) upon the motives, which induce to believe, and there parified the ground of the primitive Christians Faith with the ground we rely on, and their Motives with ours. For example. Some of them saw, others heard of the Apostles strange Miracles, admirable Sanctity &c. and thence rationally inferred that they were men sent from God and believed their Doctrin, though hard and difficult, upon their *infallible words*. Thus I discourse as to the Church, and wish the Dr, would shew where

where I miss, or give any shadow of Difference. 3. If the motives of credibility have à certain and infallible connexion with the Divine Revelation, which I grant, The Dr's supposition of fallible or probable motives in this place is wholly impertinent, and makes nothing against my *Analysis*.

19 Still he rambles on and knowes not, I think, what he would be at. It is not sufficient (saith he) to say, that the Infallibility of the Churches Testimony makes the Assent infallible, for the Assent is not according to the objective certitude of things, but the Evidence of them to our understanding. Of what objective certitude or evidence of things can this man speak, think ye? Will he say that à mysterious Trinity, or the Incarnation are evident to us, while we walk by Faith? Or dare he assert that the Truth, the Infallible Divine Inspiration, and true sense of Scripture appear evidently to our understanding; While we se innumerable called Christians at implacable variance about these matters? Unless this be maintain'd, wholly improbable, the evidence here mentioned concerning no man yet knowes what things, is plain Nonsense. Again what evidence hath the Dr of these ignote Things, who gives no greater certitude to any Assent but à

An objective
certitude
spoken of,
not expli-
cated by this
Dr.

moral one, which may be false? Yet he run's on. *Supposing the Testimony of the Roman Church to be really infallible yet since the means of believing it are but probable and prudential, the assent cannot be according to the nature of the Testimony considered in it self, but according to the reasons which induce me to believe such à Testimony infallible.* By the means here pointed at the Dr understand's the motive of credibility only, and therein err's; for we shall shew hereafter other means. But had we none, who tells him that the Motives are only probable, or barely prudential? I say they are infallible and essentially connected with the Divine Revelation, though were they only moral, the certitude of Faith is yet defensible, as will appear in the next Chapter. 2. If the Churches Testimony considered *in it self* be infallible, as he supposes, it cannot but be known as it is *infallible*, for no man will say, that God founded an *infallible* Church with intention to hide or remove from our sight her infallible Testimony, *whose final end is to teach all infallibly.* Therefore providence hath left certain means, whereby the learned may come to the knowledge of that necessary truth. I have spent three whole Chapters in the third Discourse upon this subject, yet the Dr replies

Dr replies not to one of my Arguments.

3. What ever he urges here concerning the means of believing, upon probable inducements (and it is all raked out of his Account) I have not only answered in my last Treatise, but resorted also, as you may see. *Disc. 3. 1. 2. 3. 5. 6. 7*

20 I suppose there, that S. Iohn expressed an Infallible revealed Verity concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation, when he told the world. *The word is made flesh.* I then thought Dr Still: yeilded an Assent so firm and infallible to the Revelation, that though an Angel should have preach't contrary, he would not upon any reason propoſable disbelieve it. But that Mystery is no *Self evident* truth to us, neither can it be *Scientifically* proved by an other *revealed* verity, *wholly as obscure*: all therefore that can be done is to make it evidently credible, by motives *extrinſick* to the Mystery believed? For example, as the Dr insinuates by universal Tradition, the exterior Consent of many learned men &c.

21 Hereupon ensues à troublesome difficulty. This humane fallible Tradition, this Consent, and all other Motives previous to the belief of the *Incarnation*,

The Dr raises his Faith higher than the Motives can lead to

tion, are in the Dr's Principles fallible, and may be false, yet his Faith terminated upon the *revealed Incarnation*, is so certain that it cannot be false, *Ergo* his Faith fixt there, is raised higher, and stand's firmer on that ground, then the Evidence of his Motives can induce to. And thus the Dr goes beyond all the proportion or degree of Evidence, preambulatory to his certain belief, and consequently must solve his own Argument. This and more I have in the place now cited, but the Dr's courage fail'd to return an Answer. Perhaps he will tell me, his belief of the Incarnation goes not beyond the uncertain lights of his fallible motives. Grant this, and it followes evidently. 1. That he contradict's himself, as will be proved in the next Chapter. It followes. 2. That his Faith of this *fundamental Mystery*, for ought any man living can know, may be à Lye. 3. That all Christ's Doctrin as it is now believed by Faith, may be both fallible and false. 4. That God obliges the whole Christian world to believe that, as an infallible truth, which really may be à falshood. Lastly, that all the glorious Martyrs in forgoing Ages, were bound to maintain that with the losse of their lives, *to be à truth*; which only

only apparently was so, and might in reality be no truth. If the Dr subscrib's to these consequences, he has not one dram of true Faith in his heart. Now one word more with the Dr

CHAP. VI.

Dr Still: grant's that Faith transcend's the certainty of those Motives which induce to believe. Independently of his Concession, that verity is proved, and the ground thereof firmly settled. How necessary it is to distinguish between the Credibility of a Mystery, and the infallible believing it true. Objections answered. Other difficulties proposed.

I **D**r Still: in his Account. Part. I. c. 7. P. 207. Speak's thus. *Moral certainty yields sufficient assurance, that Christian Religion is infallibly true, and he proves the Assertion, because moral certainty may evidently show us the Credibility of Christian Religion, and that from the credibility of it, the infallible truth of it may be proved, will appear by these two things. 1. That where there is evident Credibility in the matter propounded, there*

What the
Dr teaches.

there doth arise upon men an obligation to believe: And that is proved from Gods intention in giving such Motives, which was to perswade them to believe, as appears by multitudes of places of Scripture; and withall, though the meer credibility of the Motives might at first suppose some doubts concerning the Infallibility of the Doctrin, yet it is not consistent with any doubt as to the obligation to believe, because there can be no other reason assigned of those Motives of credibility, than the inducing on men an obligation to Faith.

2. That where there is such an obligation to believe, we have the greatest assurance that the matter to be believed is infallibly true: which depend's on this manifest proof, that God cannot oblige men to believe a lye, it being repugnant to all our conceptions of the veracity and Goodnes of God to Imagin that God should require of men (on the pain of eternal damnation) to believe something infallibly true, which is really false. Thus the Dr. Reflect courteous Reader. Is it so, that from the Credibility of Christian Religion, the Infallible truth of it may be proved? There is then no doubt at all, but if it be proved infallibly true, it m^y be also believed as it is, infallibly true. Doth the Dr. concede, that from the Evident Credibility of Christian Doctrin, there arises in all men an Obligation to believe it, and that this

Advantage
given by the
Dr's own
Doctrin.

this obligation is not consistent with any doubts, as to the obligation of believing is? I wish no more from an Adversary, having enough to make good all I say concerning the Infallibility of Divine Faith. Doth he finally assert, that where there is such an obligation we have the *greatest assurance*, that the matter believed is *infallibly true*, because God cannot require of men to believe that as infallibly true, which is really false? I wholly agree with him thus farr, yet withall affirm that he plainly contradict's his own Doctrin. For, if when there is such an obligation to believe, we have the *greatest assurance* (*that is, infallible assurance or nothing*) that the matter believed is infallible true, it is undisputably clear, that Faith which has that *greatest assurance*, goes far beyond the certainty of the Motives which is only moral, and not so infallible certain as the very act of Faith is. Hence it followes that the Dr contradict's himself in all he reaches concerning the moral certainty of Faith, and must, while he hold's Faith infallibly certain grant, that as terminated upon the truth of a Revelation, it rises higher and goes beyond the strength of the motives, which only afford moral certainty, and not greater. But of this more presently.

2 In the mean time, I wish the Dr would make what he saies here, to agree with some odd expressions in his precedent page 206. There we are told, *that certainty implies the taking away all suspicion of doubt, but in moral things all suspicion of doubt is removed upon moral evidence, and here he saith. Though the meer Credibility of the Motives (only morally certain) might at first suppose some doubt concerning the Infallibility of the Doctrine, yet it is not consistent with any doubt, as to the obligation to believe.* I Say contrary, if it may at first suppose some doubt, it must ever suppose it, for this moral certainty grounded on the *Miracles internal to Scripture*, as the Dr teaches, growes not less nor more perswasive in time, but is alwaies the same, and therefore cannot remove all doubt from a Believers mind.

3 Hence I argue. This moral certainty at first capable of doubt, comes in time to be infallible certainty, or still retain's some doubt. In case it be improved, and grow up to *infallible* certainty, it yeilds not in certainty to the very act of Faith, where unto it pertwades, and so the Dr's distinction, between *moral certainty*, and his term's *Infallibly true*, becomes frivolous. *Moral certainty*, saith he, *yeilds us sufficient assurance that Christian Religion, is infallibly*

An Argument proposed.

infallibly true. Say now, that this moral certainty is still consistent with some suspicion of doubt, it must either derive that doubt into the very act of Faith, and make *that doubtful*, or it ought to be granted, that Faith rises higher, and goes beyond the strength of that moral doubtful certainty, contrary to the Dr's Principles. I wish also he had explaind him self better in this other dark Proposition. *Moral certainty may be as great as Mathematical and Phisical, supposing as little reason to doubt in moral things as to their natures, as in Mathematical and Phisical, as to theirs.* These words. *Supposing as little reason to doubt*, spoil all he saies, for if moral certainty ever supposes some suspicion of doubt, how can that be as great as Mathematical or Phisical, which supposes none? But enough of this jangling.

4 We now come to the main point, and shall endeavour to shew, that, *although the Motives were only Morally certain, and not (as I hold) infallibly connected with Divine Revelation*, yet the act of Faith it self, is infallibly certain, and consequently rises above that weaker light of the Motives. This I say to vindicate the absolute infallibility of Faith from all iust exceptions, while Divines vary about the connexion of the Motives, with the Divine Revelation.

The

¶ 5 The proof of my Assertion stands firm upon two Principles laid down *Prot. without Prin. Disc. 1. C. 5. n. 6. 7. And Reas. and Relig. Disc. 3. C. 8. n. 16.* In the first place I say (and its à *Maxim* known by the light of nature) that God, who is Supreminently more infallible than all men and Angels are, ought to be believed *answerable to his Excellence*, with à most firm assent. In the second place I assert, though we have not Evidence of the Divine Testimony in it self, yet when it is made *evidently credible* by clear Signs that God speaks to us, and for our Salvation, we, as rational creatures, are obliged to submit and believe him, because *he command's* us to believe, and are thereupon bound to assent, not to the bare *credibility* of the Mysteries proposed, but to the very *truth* of them, which is à further step; and we must step so far, because the *evidence of the obligation grounded on Gods Command*, will have us do so. Here then is our assurance of the truth of the Revelation assented to. And is not this what Dr Still: teaches in express terms? *Though the meer Credibility of the Motives might first suppose some doubts concerning the Infallibility of the Doctrin, yet it is not consistent with any doubts as to the obligation to believe.* Yet more plainly. *Where there is an obligation*

By Faith we
assent not to
the bare
credibility of
à Mystery.

obligation to believe, we have the greatest assurance that the matter to be believed, is infallibly true.

6 For à further explanation of this speculative matter. Note first. That known distinction between the *Credibility* of à Mystery and the *Truth* thereof, is carefully to be reflected on, which the Dr and all those who cry against the raising Faith above the Motives, unskillfully confound. Their errour lies here, that they only consider the connexion of the Motives with the *Truth of the Mystery*, and say, the understanding by *virtue of the Motives* (only Morally certain) cannot assent to *that Truth*, and they say very right; but ponder not on the other side the weight of *God's Command*, which obliges us to trust the first Verity, though we have no evidence of the Revelation *in it self*. And thus, to use the Dr's Instance. P. 362. one not versed in Mathematicks, who cannot assent to the truth of à Demonstration in à *demonstrative manner*, may yet firmly believe it demonstrative upon his Masters credit, who knowes the truth *scientifically*, and were that Master Infallible, he might justly chastise his Scholar, did he boggle in believing the *Truth*. Much more doth this hold in God, when

But to the
Truth.

he command's our assent to à Truth evidently seen, by the Divine understanding, though obscure to us.

7 Note. 2. The motives we here speak of may, as I observed in my last Treatise, be considered two wayes. First as antecedent Faith, and naturally known *ex sensatib*, being objects of sense, seen, or heard of by undoubted History. Thus we have assurance that there is in the world à great Moral Body of men called Catholicks, agreeing in the use of Sacraments, professing Obedience to one supream *Pastor*, who manifestly shew the Succession of their Pastors from the Apostles times, give evident Signs of Sanctity in thousands and thousands, relate such and such Miracles wrought in the Catholick Church &c. 2. These Motives may be considered *as objects of Faith*, and numbred among other *Credenda*, for we believe Christ and his Apostles to have wrought true Miracles, the Church to be Holy and universal &c. And thus the Motives assented to, are not inducements to believe, but *Believed Articles*. This double acception of Motives all must own: For before the Apostles believed in Christ, they knew him to be à rational man, saw his Miracles, and by manifest signs discove-

*The twofold
acception of
Motives,
declared.*

red his Innocency and Holiness of life, yet afterward they believed by Faith, that he was truly man, and not in appearance only, that he wrought true Miracles, and believed him as we now do, both Holy and Innocent.

8 Note. 3. God has right to command us two ways. First by making his revealed will evidently known, which implies, as Divines speak, *Evidentiam in Attestante*, or à clear sight of his command, and speaking. 2. This supreme Lord, in case he make his will known by *Signs* evidently Credible, has yet as much right to require obedience from us as if it were evident, he speak's. One clear Instance will give light to my Assertion. An absolute Prince set's forth à Proclamation, and some eye or ear-witnesses receive it from his own mouth, and know it to be his: Soon after the publick *Cryer* proclaim's it in other places, distant from the Court. I say those who hear it proclaimed, and se it attested by the Princes own marks and signatures, are as much obliged to yeild Obedience to it, as if they had received the contents of it from the Prince himselfe. Pray, tell me, did you ever yet know that any town or City in England though distant from Court, when his

*The right
God has, to
Command
Faith.*

Majesty set's forth à proclamation *authoritatively* sealed by his own hand, boggle thus? It may be the publick Cryer feign's, what is not. It may be he has received à forged Writ, It may be, he knowes not the King's mind, therefore we will neither obey, nor assent to the *Truth of it*, but after all these Cryes and Signs only hold it *credible*, that such is the Kings pleasure, his will, and command.

9 Apply this to our present case and you have all. God's Revelation hath been proclaimed the whole world over. *Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles*, and the Church commissioned to speak aloud, have Age after age published it, and made the truth of it *evidently Credible* by clearer Signs then ever Prince set forth his Proclamation. Have we the Princes own Seal and Marks for the one, we have Gods own Seal and Marks for the other. It is true, we saw not the Prince subscribing his law or Proclamation, and therefore want that evidence of *Truth* considered in it self, no more saw we the Truth of God's Revelation when he first spake by his Prophets, and Apostles, but the *Signatures of his Truths* annexed to his Revelation remain still, and will do so to the worlds end. And

How faith is
made Cre-
dible.

what

what after all these glorious signs, shall we stand trifling with God in so weighty an affair as concern's eternal Salvation? Shall we tell him, because we se not evidently the Truth of his Revelation *in it self*, but only the *evident Credibility* of it, we will proceed warily and assent to its *Credibility*, but with all either abstract from the Truth, or absolutly deny it. I am sure Christ delivered contrary Doctrine, when he told S. Thomas. *Beati qui non viderunt & crediderunt*, nameing those blessed, who se not, yet believe. Thus much noted.

10 I say first. The evident Credibility of à Revelation, obliges all to accept it, not only as *evidently Credible* what the Motives persuade to. (for so much is manifest without any Submission) but to assent to it as most absolutely true, and in this sence Faith goes above the light of Motives. One reason hercof is already given. If an earthly King can oblige his subjects to obey à law *as truly his*, made *evidently Credible* as is now declared, much more can the King of Kings lay that obligation upon all, when his Revelation is made evidently Credible by Signs surpassing the power of nature. Again. Evident Credibility founded on rational

Motives perswad's and oblig's men to believe some thing, as the Dr grant's. I ask what? They need not to perswade to à belief of themselves, because their Evidence is seen before assent be given to the Revelation, and therefore both perswade, and oblige all to believe the *Infallible Truth of the Revelation*, though not evidently seen.

How the
blessed A-
postles belie-
ved?

11 I Argue. 3. and this reason convinces. The blessed Apostles firmly believed Christ our Lord to be truly God, à *Redeemer*, and the long expected *Messias*, and rested not in this judgement alone. *It is only evidently Credible, that Christ is God*, or the true *Messias*; and consequently their Faith went above the force of all the Motives laid open to their eyes, and senses.

12 I prove the consequence manifestly. Consider that great Miracle of raising Lazarus from his grave, *merely as seen* or known by sense, and preceded Faith, none can say that, that wonder (the like is of all other Miracles) evidently proved Christ to be God, or the true *Messias*. For God might have wrought that Miracle for some other end, than to assure any of Christ's Divinity. Nay, he might have impowred an Angel or à man not priviledged with
the

the Hypostatical union to call one dead, to life again, as the Prophet *Elias* did. *Kings. 3. 17. 21.* Yea and to do all the Miracles which Christ wrought. What follows therefore from the sight of these Miracles? Thus much only and no more, that as that poor widow of Seraptia truly judged *Elias*, after his giving life to her Son, *to be à man sent from God, and that all he spake was true*, so the Apostles might rationally have concluded, that our Saviours Miracles were indeed from à Power above the force of nature, but that He was thereby *evidently* proved God, appeared no evident infallible verity deduced from his wonders. Yet those blessed men, and the Primitive Christians firmly believed all these Truths by Infallible Faith, and therefore as I said now, went above the certainty of the Motives, which, *as seen*, afforded no such *infallible certainty*.

13 Some may say. If all those glorious Miracles wrought by our Saviour, neither gave evidence of his being God, nor *solely* taken, ultimately determined any to believe his Divinity, or so much as one Revealed verity; How came the Apostles and all Orthodox Christians with them to raise their Faith so high, as to believe infallibly Christs sacred

What force
Miracles, as
seen have it

Three things
necessary for
faith.

sacred Doctrin? I answer. Three things chiefly brought their Faith to this perfection. *Prodigious Works*, or Miracles (*as seen*) perswaded much; Our Saviours sacred words, *as heard*, by those he taught, added more strength, and finally the pious affection of the Will in every Believer that saw these works, and heard his words, when drawn on and encouraged by *Christ's Command* to elicit Faith, passed through all difficulties to the Contrary, and moved the understanding to believe *infallibly* the truth of what ever that great Master did speak.

14 Shall I yet touch upon these particulars more plainly? All know that the greatest Miracles which were ever done without words or Doctrin delivered by him that wrought them, make not our Christian Verities known, for had Christ appeared in the world and given life to twenty dead men, and all that time never spoken word of his Doctrin, none could have apprehended what to believe of *our Christian Mysteries*. Those therefore who saw his Miracles might well have thought him some extraordinary person sent from God (because Devils cannot restore life to the dead) but could never know by those wonders, what he judged of *Divine mat-*
ters,

are further
explicated.

ters, before they heard him speak. 2. Words alone without miraculous works induce none to believe; wherefore, had Christ come amongst us, and only told us, he was God and the true *Messias*, and wrought no Miracles, shewed no sanctity, or austerity of life, neither Iewes nor Gentils, nor indeed any, could in prudence have believed him. Hereof, see more in my notes upon Pooles Appendix n. 21. and learn withall; that Christ's *admirable works and sacred words ioyntly taken*, highly conduce to beget Divine Faith in all. *I say Ioyntly taken*, whereof we have an Instance in that glorious Transfiguration upon Mount Thabor. The Disciples there present, saw our Saviours *sacred face shine like the sun, and his garments white as snow*. Yet that vision alone, no way apt by it selfe to perswade any of his being the Son of God, might have left the Apostles in suspence concerning that Mystery. 2. They heard a voice, as S. Peter speak's 2. *Epist.* 1. 17. from the *magnificent Glory*. *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased*. That voice added to the vision, gave more strength. 3. An *express command* Close ensued upon that Vision and voice. *Ipsū audite*. Be sure to hear my beloved Son. Here all further delay ceased,

ceased, and à strict obligation was layd on them to raise their Faith above all they saw or heard, as also most firmly to believe *the truth* of what ever Christ our Lord spake.

The efficacy
of God's
Command
in order to
Faith

15 Upon this one Instance, all I would say is grounded. Ask therefore, why I by *Faith* goe above all the Signs and Miracles which Christ or his Church shewes me, or why I infallibly believe the truth of every Revelation proposed? I answer the reason is, because God who hath right to oblige, when he intimar's his will by clear Signs, prodigious works and words) *command's me to do so*, and I am as much bound to obey him upon such summons, as if the truth of the Revelation were made evident to me. Here you must either deny that God can lay such à command upon men, which is evidently false (for à temporal Prince as is now proved can do it) or grant, that I am obliged to obey his Command, and therefore can ascend with my Faith above the strength of all Motives, and believe the *Truth of his Revelation* infallibly. Otherwise you must say, God command's me to do what I cannot do, just as if he should bid me fly through the Air when I have neither power, nor w^{ings} to fly with.

16 Now mark I beseech you. All our Adversaries Arguments either tend to prove that God cannot lay that obligation upon us when he gives such Motives as perswade to believe (which yet saith Dr Still ; appears by multitudes of places of Scripture) or evince , that nothing can bring men to believe the *Truth* of a Revelation , but the evidence of it, or a clear *sight of that Truth* we assent to by Faith , which is manifestly false. Reflect once more upon the vision in Mount Thabor. The Apostles saw there our Saviour all in glory yet knew not evidently , what it meant. They heard those words. *This is my most Dear Son.* Mark. 9. 7. and understood their obvious sence , yet had no evidence of the *Truth signified by those words*. Finally, they received that command. *Ipsam audite.* Hear and believe all that this dear Son deliver's to you, but were yet far from having the truth of that command , or any thing he spake , laid out evidently before them. Notwithstanding , they believed the *very truth* of those words , and Command also , and thus their Faith led on by clear signs , *admirable works* , *sacred words* , and an *exprefs command* , transcended the certainty of what ever they saw or heard.

Neither the
Apostolical
words, nor
Works can
evidence the
truth of Di-
vine Re-
velation.

17 From what you have already noted, it followes. That if by Faith we believe the very truth of a Revelation, and not only *its Credibility*, the act of Faith cannot but be of a *higher certainty* than all the exterior Signs and Motives, as *known by sense*, can perswade to. The reason now given is clear. All these outward Signs and Motives manifested to the world, are reduced to the admirable works, miracles for example, done by Christ, his Apostles, and the Church; as also to the plain signification of words these Oracles spake, But neither the works which Christ shewed, nor the words he spake (*though plainly significant*) made the *truth of his Revelation evident*, as is now proved, but only *evidently credible*, therefore if by Faith we believe *the very truth* of a Revelation, which all grant, and rest not only upon its *Credibility*, we goe, *Eo ipso*, beyond the certainty of that judgement whereby we know it to be evidently credible, *though not shewed evidently true*. Hence I said, *Prot: without Prim. Disc. 1. c. 5. n. 6.* that all the power in Heaven cannot separate Infallibility from an act of Faith settled upon the *Truth* of God's Revelation, though Divines yet question whether by the absolute power of God,

God, all these outward Signs we se or hear of, might not have been the very same in appearance as they are now, had God never revealed any thing.

18 Some less skilful may reply. The words the Apostles heard on Mount Tabor and understood, were plain and significant enough, what need is there of more? A simple objection. Are I beseech you all significant words true? Grant this, and no man can tell à Lye, or à false story, for in such cases, words are very significant, yet far from truth. Now the Apostles did not only know the signification of that voice heard, but also believed its *Truth*, though not made *evidens* to them. This is ever to be reflected on.

*Truth is not
always Spoken by
words, most
significant.*

19 You will say again. Those words and all other written in Scripture, are either evidently *Credible*, or *evidently true*. Answ. Words *evidently Credible* in this place, imply à piece of nonsense, when by themselves they are evidently heard, and their open signification (*If clear*) evidently known, without any more light. Speak therefore thus properly. The *true* signification of words in Scripture, is made *evidently Credible*, and (*when clear*) *believed true* by Faith, yet are not known *evidently* or *Scientifically* true,

true, and the objection becomes forceles. Here I expect that such an Adversary as Dr Still: may object. 3. From this discourse it followes. Though one read Scripture à hundred times over, and add to that the interpretation of the Church, yet after all, he cannot know that Christ our Saviour is God, and the true *Messias*. I Answer, none can know these truths *Scientifically*, or vpon clear evident Principles, I grant it. None can infallibly believe them, *by virtue of God's Revelation* made evidently credible by clear signs, I deny it. After all this trifling,

20 Followes another objection much to this sence. There seem's an open contest between these Signs or the Motives inducing to Faith on the one side; and God's expresse command whereby we are obliged to believe the truth of his Revelation, on the other. The Motives draw one way, and licence us not to goe one step further than to assent to what they shew, *which is only to acknowledge God's Revelation evidently Credible*, but not infallibly true. God's Command pushes further, and will have all to believe the *Truth* of à Revelation, though we se no reason, to go so high by Faith. This objection contain's nothing but what

what is solved already. I therefore answer in a word. We see no reason to goe so high, while we rest upon the Motives only, I grant it; we see no reason to goe so high, if we attend to God's command manifested by clear signs, I deny what is assumed. For, this command, and the Majesty of the commander, is both *reason and à law more prevalent* than all Motives are, solely considered, or, as known by sense. Therefore unless the weaknes of these Motives can as it were abate or infringe the strength of God's Command and make me to judge he command's none to believe without evidence had of his Revelation, I both can and will captivate my understanding, in *obsequium fidei*, and say absolutely, what ever you my God speak (*made evidently credible by clear signes*) is not only Credible, but infallibly true. And this is to proceed rationally, for if I ought to believe à Mortal man reputed honest and sincere when he speak's, though I have no evidence of what he interiously judges, *because he may deceive*, much more am I obliged by captivating my understanding to believe God, *who cannot deceive*, when I have the greatest moral Assurance imaginable, that he speak's to me, and for my Salvation.

An objection taken from the Motives, and Gods Command, solved.

21 Now here enters that other Principle hinted at above, I mean the pious affection of the will in every Believer, which power when once enlightened by the previous judgement of Credibility, grounded upon rational Motives (*for nihil volitum quin praeognitum*) hath from that judgement assurance that no assent of the mind, is, or can be of greater concern, than an humble submission to what ever God speak's and command's, though *no evidence* of his speaking, be drawn from the *Motives* inducing to believe. The reason hereof is clear, because upon this assent eternal Salvation depend's, and the omission of it brings with it eternal misery. Besides, the great confidence all have of pleasing God who command's us to believe, and the fear we may justly apprehend of wronging his Divine Majesty in case we demurr or boggle, when we are thus incited to believe, cannot but drive the *VWill* forward with all the force it hath, to move the intellectual Faculty to à most firm and infallible assent of Faith. Hence it is, as S. Bonaventure observes, cited *Reas and Relig: Disc. 3, c. 8. n. 15.* that men truly prudent and apprehensive of their eternal good, are not drawn by torments or inticements to deny in words any revealed verity, yet few in their wits, faith

What power
the will
hath to
excite Faith.

saith the Saint, will venture to do so for à truth known by natural science. Whereupon he inferr's, that Faith is not so much à *Speculative act*, as *practical* in order to the real effects of suffering and dying for God and his truth, attested by Revelation, though not evidently seen.

22 Some may here demand, whether the Will can make the Motives inducing to Faith, to appear stronger then they are in themselves? I answer it cannot: For all know, that as *ratio Veri*, or *truth*, moves the understanding, so *ratio Boni*, or *Good* moves the will, and is its proper object. The will therefore can strongly adhere to what it rationally loves, and move the understanding to obey God, when it is evidently credible by clear Signs that He speak's, and requires obedience from us, but to force the intellectual power to see more light in the Motives than they of their own nature can give, is impossible. One may here ask. How then can the will, as Divines teach, supply the inefficacy of the Motives were there want of efficacy in them, as there is none in my Opinion, for I hold them infallibly connected with the Divine Revelation? I answer. No otherwise, then by adding constancy, and à strong *practical firmness*

to the assent of Faith ; so much flame and fervour , that if the intellectual power had yet more evidence , the adhesion would not be greater. And thus, as both Holy Scripture and the ancient Fathers speak , *corde creditur ad Salutem*. A pious Will can captivate the understanding, and move it to believe to Salvation.

23 By what is here said and further explicated in the place now cited , you see Dr Still jumbling discourse. P. 398. most weak and fixed upon no rational ground. *If the Will, saith he, can determine the understanding to assent beyond the strength of the Motives, it may determine it to assent with out any Motives at all.* Not so , Mr Dr. It is far easier to assent upon some Motives, though weak ones , then for none at all, as is evident in the rash judgements men usually make , when by the perverseness of the Will, they strongly judge upon most slight reasons such an one to be an Enemy, who never intended mischief to any , much more therefore, can this power by her pious affection when She has grave and most weighty reasons proposed to obey God , move the understanding to comply with that obligation , and to believe most firmly.

*The Dr's
ill way of
arguing.
veja Red.*

24 Now comes in the Dr's jumbling! If, saith he *the infallible assent of Faith comes from the power of the Will, then to what purpose is any formal object enquired after, or Motives of Credibility either?* Mark first an improper speech, of an *Assent coming from the power of the Will*. The assent, Sr, comes from the *understanding commanded by the Will* to assent. He goes on. *The Formal Object doth assign a reason of believing from the Object it self, of which there can be none, if the Will by her own power elicit that which is the proper assent of Faith.* *And his jumbling also.* I Answer. The understanding, if we speak properly, elicit's the assent of Faith, that is *produces it*, and not the Will. Now if the word *Elicit* import only a command, it is more then profoundly simple to assert as the Dr doth, that, that command takes away from the formal Object, *all reason of believing*. Observe I beseech you. God obliges all to keep his precepts, and one is to believe the Incarnation upon this Motive or formal object, that eternal Truth has revealed it. The *Will* because God requires that assent, readily submit's, and command's the understanding to believe the Mystery. How can this command of the will any way lessen or take from the formal Object *all reason of believing*,

when it moves the understanding to believe, because God speaks and will have us to believe so? It is impossible, unless You'll say, that because God enioyn's me not to steal, and the Will thereupon moves me to abstain from Theft I take away God's law by my obedience, which is a blasphemy. It is true, could the will, being of it selfe a blind faculty, elicit or produce Faith by its own power without any reason proposed (and this gross error lay deep in the Dr's head when he Wrot) he might then talk at random, and tell us as he doth, of no need of any Motives of Credibility, of taking away the formal Obiect of Faith, and such like Nonsense, but all is contrary, For the Will can never move the Understanding to elicit Faith, without first having the formal obiect of Faith *rationaly proposed*, and applied by most grave and weighty Motives, as shall be now briefly declared.

The Dr's
error.

25 I observed above. n. 3. That the Motives of Credibility may be considered two ways. First, as rational lights preceding Faith or known by natural discourse, answerable to our Saviours words. *Matt, 11. 4. Tell Iohn what you have heard and seen.* 2. As Truths believed by Faith, wherein there appears no difficulty at all, if which is evident, *one*
and

and the same Object can terminate two different cognitions. Thus the Apostles conversing with our Saviour, knew him by natural reason to be truly man, and yet induced by prudent Motives, they raised their Faith above sense, above all natural knowledge, and *believed*, he was indeed, *true Man*. They saw the outward appearance of his glorious Miracles, but by sense and natural discourse had no strict evidence of their being *Truths* (for sense may be deceived) or of the end for which they were wrought, however, led on by prudent Motives they believed them true Miracles, and not in appearance only. Now I ask, why could not our Saviours own Miracles, as seen, become rational inducements to believe the real truth of them, *not evidently seen*? All confess that, as seen and known by discourse, they had force enough to persuade to a Belief of what ever Christ spake, and God revealed. If so; There can be no reason why they might not also induce to a firm belief of their own being *true Miracles*; For, if the sight of them had so much force as to cast light upon another Object. Viz. The *Divine Revelation*, and to make the truth thereof, *evidently Credible*; that very sight was no less powerful to give the like clarity of their being *evident, credible Truths*. At least all must say (and

Our Savi-
ours Mira-
cles as seen,
were ratio-
nal Motives
to a believe
of their
truth.

't is mainly for my present purpose) that our Saviours Miracles, together with the other external Motives seen or known by Natural discourse, did ultimately constitute the Divine Revelation in a *complete state of Credibility*, which we call *Gods own rational speaking to the world by Signs*, or the last application of his speaking.

26 Now further. When this rational Proposition or ultimate application of God's speaking was made by miracles and other Motives, and layd open to the understanding of primitive Believers, who saw Christs wonders, the Will thereby enlightned, could easily with her pious affection, move the Intellectual power to elicit a most firm assent of Faith, because God speak's *or commands Beliefe*: which assent if ultimately resolved, we shall find securely fixed both upon the *Truth* of the Revelation, as also upon the real *Truth* of the Motives also, joyntly believed. And thus the Motives which were only inducements to Believers (*solely considered*) that is as they constituted a *Revelation and themselves evidently credible*, can under the notion of *Truths*, conjoynd with the Divine Revelation terminate a certain, and infallible assent of Faith.

27 Perhaps some half Scholars in
speculative

speculative learning, will esteem all now said confused stuff, and very likely, as the Dr expresses himself (P. 427) desire the Reader to try his faculty upon it, whether it be intelligible? No great matter for that say I. Let Smatterers talke, I appeal to the judgement of such as have been long versed in Schools, and hope to enlighten the unlearned by this one clear Instance.

*Half Scho-
lars talk, not
valued,*

18 Had Christ our Lord after his raising Lazarus from the dead, said only thus much to the then present Spectators. You have seen this one great wonder; my Disciples, and others have been Eye-witnesses of many more wrought by me. I speak now to you in the words, which my Evangelist shall hereafter register in the Gospel. *John. 10. 25. The works that I do in my Fathers name, they give Testimony of me, and with- all declare, that I am truly God and the Messias sent into the world. Believe me, induced to assent by the works you and others have seen, and moreover be- lieve, that these seen wonders are not counterfeited, but true Miraculous works. In this case it is clear, that the same Miracles first known by sense, or as they apply'd the Divine Revelation to the Believers understanding, made*

*An Instance
gives light
to my Assen-
tion,*

themselves together with the Revelation no more but evidently credible and therefore forced none to believe, but left that free, yet they imposed an obligation upon all rational men of believing *the real truth of these Miracles*, and the *Truth of the Revelation*, whereof, neither those primitive Christians, nor we ever yet had any Evidence. This is to say in plainer terms (and mark well the distinction) Miracles and all other exteriour Motives, as *seen or known*, move to a *believe of themselves under the notion of Truths*, though not *evidently seen or known as Truths*, but believed so.

29 The whole discourse in this Chapter goes upon a supposition, that the Motives of credibility are not essentially connected with the Divine Revelation, though if that essential connexion be admitted (which is true Doctrine, and much avail's to raise Faith above the strength of all exteriour Motives) yet the act of Faith terminated upon *the Revelation* and the *Truth of the Motives*, far surpasses in certainty the knowledge which any in this life can have of that connexion: for the knowledge of that Connexion is only got by natural discourse, whereas the assent of

An act of
Faith termi-
nated upon
the Revela-
tion and the
truth of the
Motives,
more certain
than huma-
ne knowled-
ge.

of Faith it self rest's upon the most *supream Verity*, I mean, God speaking, to the world. And thus in all opinions the certainty of Faith is defensible. As a rational assent, Faith depend's upon the Motives of Credibility, because God speak's by such Signs. As purely Divine, it rest's upon the Divine Revelation applyed by rational Motives, whereunto I add the *lumen fidei*, which represent's the *Truth* of the Motives, and the Revelation more *clearly and immediately*, then any natural discourse can do, and upon that account much conduces to the Infallible certainty of Faith, as is largely declared. *Reas. and Relig: Disc. 3. c. 9. n. 6* The last certainty comes from the pious affection of the will, as is already declared. Having said thus much, I desire Dr Still: to weaken any one of these Principles, upon Good Authority, or solid reason,

C H A P. VII.

Reflections made upon the Doctors following Discourse. Of his Mistakes concerning the Churches Testimony, and the obscurity of Faith.

I **I** Am forced, courteous Reader, to passe by many impertinent excursions of the Dr, his ill language also with other lesser faults, for fear of making this Treatise too bulky, which may displease him, neither do I need to enlarge my self much upon his obiections, from P. 365. to P. 400. For they are all solved in my two former Treatises. Some few particulars I shall add, more to satisfy others in this speculative matter of our Analysis, than to answer the Dr. who in very deed hath his full Answer already.

2 In the P. now cited he complain's of my shuffling, because he hear's no more of the Churches infallible Testimony, whereby men believe the Scripture to be the word of God. I stand astonished at this clamorous Adversary. Where were his Eyes, where was his attention, if ever he read my Treatises? The very chief aime whereof, is, to shew
not

not only to Christians; but to Iewes and Gentils also, that the first known ground of true Religion, is à Church manifested by Supernatural Motives proceeding from an infinit power and wisdom. This Church I have amply proved, to be God's own assured Oracle. The *Primum credible*, or first believed Teacher in this present state, and that God speak's as *immediatly* and *infallibly* by it now, as ever he did by Prophet or Apostle. As therefore those, whom the blessed Apostles taught, having seen the Apostolical Signs, immediatly believed upon their words; So with as great reason may we, having penetrated the Churches glorious Marks, assent immediatly upon Her word, and believe all She obliges Christians to believe. But to have assurance of the Scriptures *Divine inspiration*, as likewise of its true *infallible sense*, are believed Articles grounded upon the Churches Infallible Testimony, or rather upon God speaking by this Oracle, and here we must rest, or can believe Nothing. I must therefore once more blame the Doctor, who forsooth thinks, the Faith whereby the Churches *Infallibility* is believed ought to have such à *Divine Testimony*, and so à process in *Infinitem*, or à Circle will unavoidably follow. Such à *Divine Testimony*.

The Church's
Testimony, God's
own Testi-
mony

mony. Mr Dr, you understand not what I teach. I say expressly, that the *Churches Testimony* is God's *own Testimony*, as immediatly assented to upon Church Authority (*for he that hear's the Church hear's God*) as ever Doctrin was believed upon any Apostles word. Thus much supposed and largely proved what need have we of another Testimony, distinct from that of the Church? Out of all, I concluded, that as there was neither vicious Circle nor process in *Infinitum* in those who terminated their faith upon *S. Paul's* preaching, for example, so there is neither the one nor other fault in me, when I assent to this truth. *The Churches Testimony is God's own Testimony*, and ground my faith upon it. See more of this subject. *Reas. and Relig: Disc. 3. C. 6. n. 26.*

3 We have another quarel. *P. 367.* Where I am told, if all the necessity of the Churches Proposition be no more, then to convey the Divine Testimony to us (and the Dr who cites my. 3. *Disc. c. 4. n. 18.* wishes me to take pains à little better, in proving that Such à condition must have *Infallibility* belonging to it) I answer, Mr Dr misrelates my Doctrin, for I speak not in that place of the *Churches Proposition*, but of her *Motives* whereby

whereby the Divine Testimony, whether God speak's by *Scripture* or the *Church*, is applyed to us. Let him therefore take the pains to cite more exactly, or surcease to charge me with that I never taught. From this very gross error, proceed's another. *Infallibility* (saith he) *is then only necessary when it is relied upon, and is the ground of believing, and not where it is à meer condition of understanding.* In real truth, there is nothing here but à want of understanding in Mr D^r. Pray, Courteous Reader, peruse what I have. *Disc. 3. C. 6. n. 18. 19.* where I say, the Churches Testimony, is not à meer extrinsical condition, disposing to believe upon the Divine Testimony in Scripture, but *a ioynt Motive with it*, which compleat's the ancient Revelation in order to the beliefe of our Christian Mysteries. Therefore, when I believe the Church to be infallible, because *S. Paul* teaches, *She is the Pillar and ground of truth*, and believe it also because God speak's that very truth *by the Church*, I no way separate the ancient Revelation from the Churches Testimony, but by one *Indivisible act of Faith*, be-lieve both at once. Hereof I have given à clear Instance, in the Chapter now cited. n. 21. 23.

And

And constantly find by experience, that to evacuate the Dr's Arguments, no more is necessary, but only to point at what is noted in my former Treatises.

4 P. 369. He first pretend's to tell us *What these Motives of Credibility are,* 2, *How far they are necessary to Faith.* 3, *What influence they have vpon the assent of Faith.* Had he followed these particulars closely according to his own opinion, he might well have given no little advantage against himself, but in lieu of doing so, he wisely start's *aside*, and for two or three pages, only relates what *Suares, Cardinal Lugo* and other great Divines say of these Motives, and though all of them speak much to my sence, and in things material, have nothing contrary to me, Yet P. 375. He blames me because I must say, that the proofs taken from these Motives *do not persuade men to believe, or which is all one, have no Influence vpon the act of Faith.* Would to God this Dr would either not write evident untruths, or consider better what he writes. Pray you reflect. Do not I say. *Prosest: without Princ. Disc. 1. c. 5. n. 11.* That the Motives to Faith manifestly point out that true Society of Christians wherein Gods Verities are taught, and make it *discernable* from all here;

heretical Communities? Do not I say.

n. 12. That if Gods goodness could permit these Motives like false Charms to delude the world, all might with just reason exclaim, as *Rich. de S. Vist*: once did. *If we believe an error it is you, a God, who have deceived us.* Do not I say.

n. 14. That without Motives, never any since Christianity began, rightly believed in *Christ our Lord, in Apostle, or Church?* Have I not. *Reas. and Relig.*

Disc. 2 through two whole Chapters laid down the Efficacy of these Motives, and shewed what influence they have upon *Reason and Faith* also? Have

I not proved them. c. 7. n. 3. 4. to be God's own Language, or publick way of speaking to the world? And. c. 16. n. 30.

*The Dr
unjust Cas
vils.*

plainly assert, that to separate the lustre of Motives from Christ and his Church, implies a subversion of Christian Religion? And yet with me, saith our worthy Dr they perswade not to believe, nor have influence upon the act of Faith, though I say Faith never was, or can be without them.

§ But from whence comes this gross mistake of the Dr? Marry from hence, because I say that the act of Faith (*as Faith*) wholly relies upon other Principles. Good Mr Dr, cannot you conceive

One act of
Faith Ne-
cessarily de-
pend's upon
several
Principles.

ceive how one indivisible act (where in there are no separable parts) wholly relies or depend's upon several Principles, though with à different respect? Take for example à Conclusion deduced out of well ordered Premises, as à vital operation, it wholly depend's upon the *intellectual faculty*, that produces it; As à thing *in being*, it wholly depends upon Gods *general concurse* which gives existence to every creature, yet as à *Conclusion* it *wholly relies on the Premises*. The whole influence of one of these different Principles abates nothing, but is well consistent with the *whole influence* of their other associated causes. Iust thus it is in an act of Faith. *As vital*, it wholly depend's on the Intellectual power, *as supernatural*, wholly on the infused habit, or something equivalent. *For its Being*, it depend's on Gods universal concurse, whereby every thing exist's, but as à *rational operation*, it wholly depend's on the *Motives inducing to Faith*, not that the motives, considered merely *as inducements*, concurr by way of *efficiency* to that act, any more then premises to à conclusion, but because the *judgement of Credibility*, which actually inform's the mind in the very instant à Believer first elicit's Faith, illuminates his intellectual power, and manifestly shew's
what

what he is ready to believe, *is evidently Credible*, or worthy à most certain assent, *because God speak's by his own Oracle*. O! but the act of Faith precisely fix't upon the Divine Revelation reasons not, and consequently, saith our Dr seem's unreasonable, or hath no ground to rely on.

6 This difficulty I have both proposed in exprefs terms, and solved. *Reas. Relig: Disc. 3. C. 16. n. 25.* and say there, an act of Faith may be considered two ways. First as it is à *prudent reasonable submission* to what ever God reveals. 2. as terminated upon the Revelation proposed by the Church, or any other infallible Oracle. Under the first notion of à *prudent submission*, it either necessarily implies, or presupposes the rational prudent judgment of *credibility* set fast on such Motives as converted the world, which judgement rightly denominat's Faith à *reasonable Obsequiousness*. But again consider the act in it self, I mean as it precisely tend's upon the Revelation, and à *Mystery not evidently seen*, it cannot reason at all, nor more prove, or *Scientifically* know its object (*as it* ^{where an Act of Faith reasons not?} *rest's there*) than *Science* as *science* believe. Thus I then answered, and though the Doctor hitherto never took the least notice of my reply,

L

yet

yet we shall find him hereafter when his *rational Evidence of Christian Religion* comes to a trial, much born down with this very difficulty.

7 In the mean while to give some hints at what I shall then say. I ask when the Dr (who talks much of Faiths evidence) believes the Mystery of the Incarnation upon this sole ground that God reveals it in Scripture, what rational evidence can he derive into his Faith, if you precisely consider it, as fixed upon *the Revelation and Mystery together*? None arises from the nature of these things *purely believed*, unless he stoutly affirm (and he is as like to do it as any man living) that he evidently see's by his new eyes of Faith the intrinsick *infallible truth of the Revelation* in it self, as also the two natures in Christ, *Humane and Divine*. I say by *virtue of that act*, as it is precisely terminated upon the object believed, which if I rightly understand him. P. 387. *fine*, he acknowledges *to be obscure*, and upon that account unmeet to ground Evidence? What then is to be done? O, saith the Dr I will fetch my Evidence not from the *Nature of the things believed*, for they are remote and dark, but from the evidence of sense *as to the Miracles wrought by Christ*, from the *Testimony of those*

those who saw Christ our Lord, and have delivered his Doctrine to us, and given the greatest Evidence of their fidelity &c. See his pages. 387 and 416. Very good, let all yet be as he pleases.

8 Hence it follows first. That the Dr's act of Faith as it tend's upon the Revelation, *not evidently seen*, and an *obscure* Mystery together, is so far blind, yea and like a Mole, working without light (They are his own words P. 353)

as that Faith is, which he would impugn, and this I chiefly insist upon at present. It follows. 2. That his one

indivisible act of Faith is both clear and obscure; as fixed upon his supposed evident Motives, it is clear, and under another respect *obscure*, as it adheres to an *obscure object believed*. For so he speak's. P. 387. *I had rather thought*, saith he, *the more obscure the object had been* (for *is little better than Non-sence to call an act of Faith obscure*) *the greater necessity there had been of strong evidence to persuade &c.*

One word, Mr Dr by the way. I think it far greater Nonsense to call objects *à parte rei* obscure, if we use proper language. A pore blind man stumbles at a stone, is the stone therefore obscure, while another sees it clearly, and stumbles not? Thus all objects obscure to

*The Dr
own's Faith
both clear
and obscure*

our weak Capacities, are clear and evident to God and Angels. Clarity and obscurity, Mr Dr, as I have often noted (but you never mend your faults when told of them) are inseparable proprieties of vital operations, and belong not to *Things* in rigour of speech, though in à vulgar way with à respect to our acts, the language may pass. Again, shift all you will, if the object in your sence be obscure, your act of Faith, as it is fixed upon that clouded *verity*, cannot but under that notion and respect, be obscure also.

9 It followes. 3. That, had the Dr pitch't on the true Evidence of Credibility, which is not done, I have all that for my Faith with much more to boot taken from the Churches *long continuance*, Her *Miracles*, *Sanctity*, *Conversions*, and other *Motives*. Whereof see, *Reas. and Relig. Disc: 2. C. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11.* Now if the Evidence of Credibility once established necessary in the Church, be ever prerequired as an inducement to believe (as all confess) it little import's Christianity, whether it be discovered by the *very act of Faith*, or the *Judgement previous* to Faith, supposing, as I said above, that this judgement inform's and illuminat's the understanding,

derstanding, chiefly at every mans first Conversion. Did I come short of the Dr in the evidence of Credibility, he might justly blame me, but when in reallity he has none, as we shall se hereafter, and I introduce such an Evidence *as converted the world*, Say I beseech you wherein am I faulty? Marry in this may the Dr reply, that I allow not evidence to the very act of Faith, but only to the previous judgement of Credibility. No hurt at all, while the mind has the evidence of Credibility laid open, and the Dr's very act of Faith (such an one as it is) is partly clear, partly obscure.

where the Evidence of Credibility is found.

10 But to quiet the Dr I can without prejudice to my Opinion, much less to Christian Religion, grant with many learned Divines, that one indivisible act of Faith rest's both upon the Motives, and the revealed Mystery together. Nay more, I do hold that the Motives are *God's own language* whereby he speaks to the world, not imitable by any Enemy, *for, etiam factis loquitur Deus*, as S. Austin often cited, affirm's. See *Reas. Relig: Disc. 3.* I say. 3. The obligation of believing first arises from the light of these Motives, for no man saies, he believes, *because he believes*,

The obligation of believing arises from the Motives.

note the ra-
tional
ground.

but therefore believes, because antecedently to his Faith; he judges it most reasonable (upon God's command) to believe, what is revealed. The Revelation therefore obscurely proposed to us cannot, as *obscure*, be the rational ground of our firm assenting to it, and for this reason to avoid confusion in the *Analysis*, I attribute Evidence to the previous judgement of Credibility and not to the very act of Faith. Though I scruple nothing to grant that I believe also for the *Motives*, which, as I now said, have their influence upon Faith, and therefore the Dr flatly calumniat's, when he tell's me over and over, that I believe without reason, without grounds and Motives; That I have Motives and evident Motives (P. 382). yet after all this Evidence, believing hath nothing to do with them. *Just as if a man should say* (P. 384.) *there is a particular way of seeing with ones eyes shut.* He might better have said, his intellectual Eyes were darkened when he read my Treatise, for no Author ever gave greater strength and efficacy to the Motives then I have done, when I lay not only Faith, but Christ also, the Church, Scripture, and all true Religion goes to wrack without them. I further assert, that a Believers mind is so far from being in a
state

The Dr's
cavil,
groundless.

state of darkness, in the instant it elicits Faith, that even then it is environed with the light of these Motives, clearly represented by the judgement of credibility, the lustre whereof is so great, that as many Divines teach, they make Faith evident in *Assentance*. This opinion I could maintain, and yet defend the obscurity of Faith in order to its *Material object*, as the Dr withall his pretended Evidence must do, whereof more presently.

11 P. 376. He seem's some what resty, ruminates again his old difficulty and ask's, *whether in requiring an Infallible assent of Faith to the Churches infallibility upon Motives confessedly fallible, an assent be not required beyond all proportion and degree of evidence.* First. Who tells you, Mr Dr, that the Motives are confessedly fallible? The Church never defined so, I with others expressly say, they are Metaphysically certain, and have infallible connexion with the Divine Revelation. It is true, some Divines hold them fallible, but it is only an opinion, and therefore too weak to support your stout expression (*confessedly fallible*) or to make the contrary opinion improbable. But suppose them fallible I have notwithstanding shewed, how the act of Faith is

most certain and infallible, and shall here for the better satisfaction of a less learned Reader upon this hint given by the Dr, apply all I have said above to the Catholick Church. Thus I discourse.

*Though the
Motives to
Faith were
fallible,
Faith yet
stands firm.*

12 God, an eternal Truth, who perfectly comprehend's all things, intuitively Seing himself one Essence and three distinct Persons, reveal's that Verity, and to the end all may assent to it by Faith, He adorn's his own Oracle the Catholick Church *with the Royal Signs of his Power and wisdom.* The Church thus illustrated, speaking in the name of God, or which is all one, God speaking by Her, proposes that high Mystery and obliges all to believe it. The Signs or Motives whereby he speaks to reason (*manifest in the Church*) make it evidently credible that eternal Truth speak's, and in order to Faith, are the only *exteriour rational lights* we have in this present State, from whence Faith takes it rise, and whereupon it necessarily depend's. But the highest measure of certainty these motives (*considered as rational inducements*) can give any, is only, as I say, to make the Mystery *evidently credible, not evidently true*, Yet on the other side, when we prudently reflect

flect upon God's powerfull speaking by *Signs and Motives*, and withall ponder the *weight of his Command* which obliges us to assent, not only to the *Credibility of a Mystery*, but to its *very Truth*, a pious will both can, and is bound to move the understanding to passe, as it were, above *that Credibility*, and to believe the *Infallible truth of the Revelation*, which revealed truth, by help of other Principles mentioned in the foregoing Chapter, advances Faith to infallible certainty, and therefore farr transcends that intellectual light rising from the Motives, and also goes beyond the *plainest signification of words* Christ ever spake, because Faith, as Faith, ultimately relies not upon the bare *signification of words, or on the exterior sight of Miracles*, but upon the *real Truth of Gods Revelation* pointed at by *words, and works*, though by such outward Signs not *evidently proved true*. And thus you se first, what the obscurity of Faith implies, or wherein it consist's. It consist's in this, that through Obedience to God's Command, we raise our selves above the force of all Motives inducing to Faith, and firmly believe upon *another's Authority* (I mean God's Divine Testimony) that to be *infallibly true*, though we neither se the Testimony nor the thing attested, *evidently true*. You se. 2.

That

That our Dr's long Tattle of Faith transcending the Motives of Credibility serves only to amuse an unwary Reader, or rather to tell the learned, that he shamefully mistakes, and handles one difficulty in place of another, for according to his promise, he should either have proved that *Faith is self*, or the *Church is fallible*, but all this while he run's astray, and never meddles with that main Question, contenting himself to impugn, (and most weakly) à School opinion only.

13 And here by the way I cannot but wonder at our Dr's simplicity who cites Doctour Holden, saying. *That no assent of Divine Faith can have any greater true and rational certainty, then the assent of the Medium hath, by which the object of Faith is applied to the understanding.* First. What if Dr Holden differ from others in explicating the certainty of Faith, doth he therefore hold it fallible or only morally certain? This followes not. 2. Dr Still: should here have told us, what is meant by those words: *The assent of the medium by which &c*? For if the Catholick Doctour teach, that the Medium now spoken of, is the Divine Revelation applied by Motives *Metaphysically certain*, he may well assert, that *Faith, as true and rational (mark the words)* can have no greater

greater certainty then that medium, known by natural discourse, gives, yet this hinders not that higher certainty grounded on the Revealers Authority believed, and upon God's command, as is already explained.

14 Dr Still: from his P. 376 to P. 400. besides endless Tautologies all tending to shew Faith unreasonable for want of Motives (already answered) and much ill language, not worth answering, gives me little to reflect on. Yet his 383 P. must not passe wholly unexamined, where got into à Dungeon he cries out against the obscure tendency of Faith upon its own object, though he knowes, or should know, that old Maxim, *Fides est credere quod non vides*. The truth is grounded vpon our Saviours words to S. Thomas. *Blessed are those who believe and have not seen*. Its grounded on S. Peters words. 2. Epist 1. 19. *A light shining in à dark place*, upon S. Austin's Doctrin. Epist. 85. *Faith hath its eyes wherewith after some manner (quodammodo) it may see that to be true, which yet it sees not*, and the Authority of many other Fathers. Therefore S. Thomas rightly conclud's. 2. 2. q. 5. a. 2. corp. That the Intellectual power assents to à matter believed, not because it see's it, either in

All Authors ascribe an obscure tendency to Faith.

it *selfe*, or by any resolution made into the first *Principles Seen*; but because it is convinced by the Divine Authority to assent to things, *Qua non videt*, which it see's not. Hence also Catholick Divines inferr, that the very act of Faith purely considered as *Faith*, see's not by any evidence *the Truth* of what we believe, otherwise *to se evidently and to believe*, would be the same thing contrary to Christ words, which annex happines to believing *without seeing*, or *clear evidence* had of that object yet in darkness, never to be perfectly dispelled, untill we se God in the next life.

15 But saith Dr Still. *The great things we believe are received upon the Authority of the Revealer, yet so, that we assert, we have as great evidence that these things were revealed by God, as the matter is capable of.* Here is no man knowes what hudled up in this dark expression. *As the matter is capable of.* Let us therefore proceed plainly. You, Sr, believe the *Mysterious Trinity* because, as you think, God reveal's it in Scripture. Have you by your *act of Faith* (for here we speak not of the previous rational Evidence of Credibility) *Evidence*, that such a Revelation (which was and is yet God's free act and might not have been) doth

now

now really exist ? Have you evidence of the *true Sence* of those words whereby you judge the Trinity is revealed ? Have you evidence of their being words *divinely inspired* ? Have you any thing like evidence of the Mystery believed ? No ; All the Miracles which Christ and his Apostles wrought cannot make these particular truths to appear *evident to any* in this State, yet Orthodox Christians believe them Infallibly true by Faith , and therefore you, Sr, are as deep in à Dungeon as any you ieer at, get out how you can.

16 The rest that followes is nothing but an idle sporting with S. Paul's Doctrin. *Heb. 11. 1. Is it not pretty, saith the Dr, because Faith is called an Evidence, therefore it must be inevident ? Because it is called an Argument, therefore it can use none.* What stuff is here ? Who ever said that Faith uses not Arguments ? Or called it à *Conviction* but as the Apostle speaks, *of things not seen* ? Soon after he has à lash at me, and it reaches S. Austin also. I had said, no merit or thanks in believing, had we evidence of the Mysteries we believe , and I speak with S. Austin, *In Evangel.*
Ioan.

Truths ;
whereof the
Dr hath not
Evidence

174 Part. 1. c. 8. More of the Dr's discourse,
Ioan. Trac. 79. This is the praise of Faith,
if that which is believed, be not seen. For
what great thing is it, if that be believed, which
is seen? According to that sentence of our
Lord, when he rebuked his Disciple, saying,
because thou hast seen me Thomas, Thou hast
believed. Blessed are they who have not seen
and have believed.

CHAP. VIII.

The Doctor's Discourse from page 400,
to P. 416. Considered, and
found weightless.

The Dr hard
put to his
Shifts.

HERE the Dr would fain rescue
another Argument taken out of
his Account, from the objections I made
against it, *Reas. and Relig: Disc. 2. C. 2. n. 5.*
And you may see him hard put to it for
proofs, when to shew the Church no
way necessary to ground Faith, he run's
up to the woman of Samaria. *John 4.* to Bar-
barians, and others, who all received Di-
vine Revelation and believed without
an infallible Church. In plain English
he would infer, that the Christian Ca-
tholick Church, before it was perfectly
founded, or owned as God's Oracle, did
not then ground Faith, therefore it
could

could never do so, after its compleat establishment. Is not this an heroical attempt? Tell me, Mr Dr. what sence have we in this Inference? The Samaritan woman believed Christ when the Church was not perfectly in being, Therefore S. Austin when it was an absolute built moral Body, erred much in saying. *He would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholick Church moved him to believe it. Which authority once weakened,* saith the Saint, in the same place, *contra Epist: Fundam. I cannot believe the Gospel. S. Dyonisius and Damaris. Act. 17.* who knew nothing of the Churches beginning at Hierusalem on whitsunday, hearing S. Paul an *Infallible Oracle* preach, believed, *Ergo* Christians that lived in time of the Nicene Council could not then believe the Church. What Logick is this? Nay more; in the Dr's Principles, that Article of our Creed, I believe the Holy Church stands there to no purpose, because forsooth, in some extraordinary circumstances and occasions Faith may be had without knowledge of the Church, of Scripture and of Christ also: For many Divines hold, that Barbarians by meer contemplating the visible works in nature, may without the teaching of a living Oracle come to the know-

176 Part. 1. c. 8. More of the Dr's discourse,
knowledge of one God as à Rewarder,
and have Faith available to Salvation.
Now here is the Dr's erroneous Principle,
that which in some circumstances serves to beget Faith, may ever serve,
and in all occasions.

*Ancient
Christians
had true
Faith, before
scripture
was written.*

2 The unsoundness, or rather Nonsense whereof, I will demonstrate against Mr Dr. The ancient Christians had true Faith before the Canon of Scripture was extant. Now that holy Book being published and received all over, our Dr ground's his Faith upon it, only as its understood by every man's discerning faculty, what therefore once was no rule nor ground of Faith (because not in being) afterward becomes à ground when it is known and published. Just thus we discourse of the Church. When the woman of Samaria and some Barbarians believed, the Church was not founded, nor known or owned by all as Gods Oracle, but afterward the foundation of it being perfectly laid, and Pastors and Doctors appointed by Christ to teach the world, it was owned for God's Oracle, and then brought with it an obligation upon all to hear and believe it.

3 The reason hereof, more amply laid forth in my last Treatise, is taken from

from the exprefs constitution of Christ, who erected the Church as à most facile, clear, and *living Rule of Faith*. This great Master assures all, that *whoever hear's the Church, hear's him*. That *Faith comes by hearing*, and therefore Pastors and Doctors are appointed to teach to the *consummation of Saints, unto the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of Christ's Mystical body &c.* Wherefore Baronus in his *Apodixis, Tract: 9. puncto. 2.* ingenuously professes. *That the Testimony of the present Church is à condition necessarily required to believe the authority of the Scripture, because Faith comes by hearing.* Hence I argue. A law made by Christ is to be observed, the ordinary means appointed by the Law-giver Himselfe for the grounding of Faith, ought in no case to be neglected. But Christ hath obliged all who believe, to rely on *the Christian Church ever since She was made an Oracle known to the world*, as is largely proved *Reas. and Religion*, through the whole Second Discourse, therefore though by *accident* or in some very unusual circumstance, men have had Faith without any knowledge either of Scripture, or Church, Yet now after

M

the

178 Part. 1. c. 8. *More of the Dr's discourse,*
the Churches compleat *establishments*, and
Her long continuance to exclude her Au-
thority, and believe upon any other
ground would be so great folly and rash-
ness, that God may justly deny his super-
natural Grace to such unadvised Belie-
vers, who therefore would not have
Faith to Salvation.

4 Pray you tell me, should à Barba-
rian that never heard of Church or Scrip-
ture, yet may probably believe in God,
as à *Rewarder of Good*, by à meer contem-
plation of the Heavens &c. Should, I
say, such an one come to the knowledge
of Christ, of the *Scripture*, and of the
Church, gloriously illustrated with all
her Motives, Can this man, think you,
in these new circumstances of à *greater*
light, neglect all, and believe, that God
will reward good upon the *old motive*, to
wit, the visible beauty or motion of the Heavens?
No; That belief would *now* be impru-
dent, and upon that account unavaila-
ble to Salvation, *What therefore serves to*
ground Faith in some circumstances, serves not
in all. We have yet another Instance
against the Dr, who hold's there is à
Thing in being called the Church of
England, where he preaches, and pre-
tend's to settle his Faith upon Scripture
only. Would he like it well, should
some

*The Dr's
grand Prin-
ciple, proved
forfeals*

some of his Hearers tell him, they build not their Faith upon any Doctrin, *as it is delivered in Scripture*, or by the Church of England, or finally taught by Mr Dr, but purely believe upon the *Barbarians Motive*, or, as the Samaritan Woman believed upon *our Saviours words*, long since spoken. *I am the Messias?* I perswade my self he will not easily approve any such extravagancy. Yet he must, if he proceed consequently, to his indigested Discourse, for the Faith of that Samaritan woman and Barbarians also was *truly Divine*, and why may not his People believe as they did independently of all Scripture, and the Church of Englands Doctrin, as he would now have us to believe independently of the Catholick Churches Testimony? For here is his Principle, or he speak's Non-sence. What was once sufficient to propound or ground Faith, *may be ever sufficient, and in all circumstances.*

5 One may reply, That Samaritan and Barbarians likewise, believed upon *God's word* not then written, but spoken, which afterward became *the Doctrin of Scripture*. Very right, and so say I, they believed upon that Doctrin which afterward was, is, and ever will be taught by the Church, but as then there was no

180 Part. I. c. 8. *More of the Dr's discourse*,
written Scripture, So there was no
Church founded to propose or ground
Faith upon. And thus the *Proponent* of
Faith may vary, though the ultimate
Motive or *formal object* of it, which is
Gods Revelation never changes. *The*
variety of an Infallible Oracle, varies not the
Formal object of Faith.

6 By what is here noted you se,
how pitifully the Dr abuses himself and
Reader, P 407. I had said. n. 7. That
none can make the Roman Catholick
Church in all circumstances the only sure
foundation of Faith, upon this Princi-
ple chiefly, that *Faith in general* requires
no more, but only to rely on God the
first Verity speaking by one or more lawfully
sent to teach, who prove their Mission,
and make the Doctrine proposed evidently
Credible. A fair concession, replies the Dr,
which plainly destroy's the necessity of the
Churches Infallibility in order to Faith. For,
if no more be necessary in order to Faith, but
to rely upon God speaking by this or that Ora-
cle, how comes the Infallible Testimony of the
Church to be in ~~in~~ any Age necessary to Faith?
A fair Concession on my part, Mr Dr,
but a foul mistake on yours. For, have
not I all along proved (though you Answer
nothing) that the Church is one of the In-
fallible Oracles whereby God speaks, as imme-
diately

The Dr
abuses the
Reader and
grossly mis-
takes.

diarly and infallibly, as ever he spake by Prophet or Apostle? And must not you admit two or three Infallible Oracles? The Apostles who taught Christianity before the writing of Scripture were Infallible Oracles, Scripture it self, completely finished and set forth, say you, *is another*, and I hope you will not deny but that S. John the Evangelist, who lived à considerable time after the whole Canon was Signed, kept still his Apostolical authority, and *remained Infallible*.

7 Observe now, Gentle Reader. Doth the Dr destroy the necessity of the Scriptures infallible Testimony, because he own's the Apostles Oral teaching Infallible? No. How then do we destroy the Churches Infallibility in saying, that Faith in *General*, only requires to rely upon the first *Verity* speaking by this, or that Oracle? For, if two or three distinct Oracles subvert not the Dr's Faith built upon Scripture, how can more Oracles then one, overthrow mine built on the Church? The Question therefore in this place is not, whether the Churches Testimony *be Infallible*, but precisely thus much, whether the Dr's Inference have any thing like reason in it? *Viz. Faith relies on God speaking by this or that Oracle, Ergo it cannot rely on God speaking by the Church.* The inference plainly appear's Non-sense

*An Argument
against ad
hominem*

*A modest
offer made
to the Dr.*

182 Part. 1. c. 8. *More of the Dr's discourse,*
unless the Churches Testimony be first
proved fallible. Now should the whole
contest come to the *Churches Infallibility*,
after all I have said of it (whereunto the
Dr never yet replied word) I am most
willing and ready, to discusse again this
particular Controversy with him in à
Treatise apart, upon all the Principles
Christian Religion can afford, *Scripture*,
Church, *Fathers*, and *manifest Reason*. Is
not this à fair modest offer?

*The Dr's
improbable
Supposition,
refuted.*

8 What follows in the Dr upon
this subiect is more than simple. *God*,
said he, spake by Christ and his Apostles as
Oracles, by whom his word is declared to us,
Therefore nothing can be necessary to Faith,
but to rely on the first Truth speaking by them.
Marke here an improbable Supposition
made use of for à proof, as if, forsooth,
every one by casting an eye upon Scrip-
ture after some diligence, could exactly
declare, what Christ and his Apostles
taught; whereas I have told the Dr over
and over, and it is the grand Principle
I rely on, that none can in this present
State say absolutely, what Doctrin those
first great Oracles delivered, even in the
Fundamentals of Faith; none can know the
true sence of the words registred in Scrip-
ture, or assert, that they were *Divinely in-*
spired without the *Infallible Testimony* of
the

the Church. I say *Infallible*, For if *She* Teaches so fallibly, that her Doctrin may be false, much better were it, I think, that *She* never speak, or define at all. Thus you have in brief my Principle, further explained in the two last Treatises, whereof the D^r has taken no notice hitherto, and the reason most certainly is, because he knowes not what to answer.

9 The very most that goes before or followes in the D^r on this subject, besides much ill language, is à meere rehearsal of *what his* Account contains, and as he repeat's his old Obiections, so I need to do no more, but only to return my Answers, given *Reas.* and *Relig.* cited above, beginning from. n. 8. and. 9. He demanded in his *Account*, and here has the same. *With what Faith did the Disciples of Christ at the time of his suffering, believe the Divine Authority of the old Testament?* I answered. Supposing à total subversion of the Jewish Church (not to examin now the difference between the Infallibility of the Synagogue and our Christian Church) The Disciples had our Blessed Lord present most able to ascertain them, that he came not to cancel any *Divine revealed Truth* in the old Scripture, (for that was impossible) but

to fulfil the ancient *Prophecies*, and to establish a new law of *Grace*, far more perfect than the ceremonial Law had been, and that upon his *sole Authority*, the Disciples believed the verities of the old Testament. Admit therefore, that the high *Priests* and *Elders* had all erred in consenting to our Saviours death, this only followes, as I answered. n. 9. that their Priviledge of *not erring*, lasted only to Christ's comming, as, *S. Luke 16. 16. testifies, Lex & Prophetæ usque ad Ioannem*, which is to say, Christs sacred Kingdom being then at hand, and to remain to the worlds end, the Prophets ceased to prophesy of His appearing in flesh, and had no longer that Infalible gift. Answerable hereunto one might assest, were it needful, that the High Priests infalible power in judging, fail'd also at that time, though the Dr will have a hard task to prove, that *Caiphas's* Judgement was erroneous, in case he ponder well *S. Johns words*, c. 11. 50. *You know nothing, neither do you consider that it is expedient for us, that one man dy for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this he said not of himself, but being the High Priest of that year he Prophecied, That Iesus should dy for the Nation and not only for the Nation &c.*

Observe

what he
repent's to
his purpose
hath been
solved.

Observe well. It was *expedient* that Christ should dy, and though a wicked man spake the words, yet the Spirit of truth which guided his tongue (*for he spake not of himself*) erred not. And this proves, that God often preserves truth as well by an unworthy Prelate, as by one really worthy where *Order and Office* is to be regarded, and not the *dignity or Indignity* of the person. Now whether all the subordinate Judges of the *Sanhedrin* were infallible, is a new question not pertinent to the matter in hand. It is more satisfaction then I owe the Dr to shew that the Supream Judge of the *Sanhedrin* (who ever presided over the rest) much less the whole Church of the Iewes erred not. Witness S. Joseph of *Arimathea*, *Nicodemus*, and innumerable others, dispersed all Jury over, who all were faithful and free from error.

10 Concerning the other Question hinted at, None I think can doubt, but that the High Priests in all grand Judicatures were infallible, which Priviledge *Moses* certainly enjoyed, and *Amaris* also 2. *Paralip.* 19. 11. *Moses* induced by Iethro his Counsel. *Exod.* 18. 13, made Choice of some others to Judge in causes of lesser

186 Part. 1. c. 8. More of the Dr's discourse,
 lesser importance, reserving greater
 matters to himself. Num. 11. 16. God
 commanded Moses to call together seven-
 ty of the Elders in Israel for his assistan-
 ce, appointed to bear the burthen with
 him, and at their election had the Spi-
 rit of Prophecy. After Moses death,
 the Prophets, *Iosue, Samuel, David, Elias,*
Eliseus &c succeeded, and these certain-
 ly were Infallible. But there is no need
 of staying longer upon this point, being,
 as I said, not pertinent to our present En-
 quiry relating to the Infallibility of our
 Christian Church.

11 The Dr P. 408. err's not à little,
 while he supposes the Infallibility of the
 Roman Church to be lodged in the Su-
 pream Ecclesiastical Iudges, *and no where*
els, To this I answered directly. *Reas.*
and Relig: Disc. 3. C. 12. n. 14. (much
 wonder it is the Dr's eyes saw it not) and
 said, when we resolve Faith into the
 Churches Infallible Authority, we un-
 derstand by the *Church*, the whole *diffu-*
sed body of Orthodox Christians made mani-
 fest by Supernatural Motives and not
 in the *first place*, the *Representative* in Ge-
 neral Councils: For, that more *explicite*
 Beliefe had of General Councils con-
 naturally presupposes (when à right
 Analysis is made) the other general
 Truth

Truth
 Societ
 the on
 tholi
 Body
 Hea
 swer
 belo
 Hell
 The
 Sha
 pag
 cur
 not
 liev
 wis
 Jew
 Inf
 ha
 th
 of
 th
 be
 an
 g
 P
 y
 st
 g
 b

UMI

The Chur-
 ches Tradi-
 tion, is in-
 fallible.

188 Part. 1. c. 8. More of the Dr's discourse.
 cause, all that Testimony with him is
 fallible, and may be false, and if the Jewes
 had no surer Ground to believe the old
 Prophecies, they could not assent to
 them by Divine Faith. In our Catho-
 lick Principles there is no difficulty at
 all, *because we hold the Tradition of the*
Church infallible. Yet as I noted in the
 last Treatise, the first consent of Chri-
 stians owning these books Divine, pre-
 supposed them taken as *Divine* upon the
 Authority of an Infallible Oracle, and
 first made them not accepted as *Divine*,
 for no man will say Scripture is *first*
 owned as à book *Divinely inspired* by the
 Holy Ghost, because Christians Say
 so, but contrarywise, *therefore they say so,*
and agree in that truth, because God an-
 tecedently to the universal consent assu-
 red all by an Infallible Oracle, that they
 were of *Divine Inspiration.*

13 P. 410. we have fearful Doings
 about à man of clouts, where the Dr
 sadly complain's, that I fall *unmercifully*
to work with this man of Clouts (He means
 himself) *that I throw him first down and*
trample upon him, then *I set him up again,*
to make him capable of more valour bring
shown upon him, then *I kick him afresh and*
beat him of on side, then on the other, and so
 terribly triumph over him, that the poor man
 of

of C
 of fl
 cost
 in
 this
 eve
 jud
 wit
 bon
 de
 for
 fai
 my
 my
 the
 aff
 les
 hi
 D
 ve
 M
 n
 P
 n
 H
 li
 a
 I
 st
 n

Truth assented to. Viz. *This manifested Society of Christians is God's own Church, and the only way to Salvation.* Hence all Catholics avouch that the whole Catholick Body consisting of Pastors to teach, and Hearers to learn, cannot totally err, or swerve from truth, whereunto properly belong those promises of the Gospel. *Hell gates shall not prevail against the Church. The spirit of truth abides with Her for ever. She is the Pillar and ground of Truth &c.*

12 The Dr. err's again in his next page, where he demand's why the concurrent Testimony of all Christians may not afford as sufficient a ground to believe the books of the new Testament, without an Ecclesiastical Senate, as those Jewes (who no more believed Christ Infallible, than the Sanhedrin did) might have a sufficient ground to believe, that the Prophecies came not in old time by the will of God? This I take to be the sence of the Dr's *Querie*, which after his manner he spin's out to a tedious length. I answer, though the Jewes had sufficient ground to believe, that those ancient Prophecies were not from man, but God, yet the concurrent Testimony of Christians, in the Dr's *Principles*, is no certain ground to believe the Authority of the books of the new Testament. First because.

An other
Error of
the Dr.

UMI

of Clouts blesteth himself, that he is not made of flesh and bones, for if he had, it might have cost him some aches and wounds? What, in the name of God, put the Dr. into this strange trembling fit? Will not every one that read's these *Threnes*, judge that I have dealt most rudely with a Doctor, and deem my crime horrid, one surely of the first magnitude, to be wash't away with teares and sorrow? Please to hear it. Marry, I said, *Disc. 2. c. 3. n. 9* (and the Dr. cites my words) *That I verily thought Mr Still: mistook one objection for an other?* And is this all? Not one syllable more, I assure you, that can give offence, unless he be angry with me for not calling him Doctor when I knew nothing of his Doctorship.

The Dr's
more than
ridiculous
Complains.

14 P. 411. He ask's, how those believed Infallibly who only heard of Christ's Miracles, but saw them not? I answered, n. 15. Every immediate Conveyer or Propounder of Christ's Doctrine needs not to be Infallible, though before those Hearers, whether Barbarians or others believe, an Infallible Oracle must be known and relyed on. See more hereof, n. 16. for I am weary in following such weightless stuff, yet in the next page you have more of it, where he blames me as one

Every one
that proposes
faith need's
not to be in-
fallible.

one senseless, because I say. n. 12. that fewer Motives may serve to induce young Beginners, seldom molested with difficulties against Faith, witness S. Austin cited above. *Ceteram turbam* &c, than will convince the more learned, who often struggle to captivate their understanding to our high Christian Mysteries. And is not this exactly verified in *Luther, Calvin*, and innumerable others, who when *Beginners* easily submitted to all the Church teaches, yet afterward when more learned, they found (*unless they tell the world loud lies*) Motives to dissuade them from their first Faith. Such men therefore seduced by fallacious Arguments, or rather by their own malice, should have been better grounded in that one Principle whereon all Christian Doctrine wholly depend's, the *Infallibility of Christs true Church*.

15 P. 414. I meet with à jeer, because I hold *Protes: without Princ: Disc: 1. c. 2. n. 3.* That every Bishop or Pastor, though not personally infallible, yet when he is *lawfully sent to teach*, and speak's in the name of God and the Church, considered as à member conioyned with the *Infallible Church*, may be said to teach infallibly. *An admirable speculation replies the Dr and, so saith he, may every one in the streets*

streets be infallible, not as considered in himself, but as à member conjoyned with truth, or every Sectary as à member conjoyned with God's word. Reflect, Mr Dr. is every one we meet in the streets, à Bishop or Pastor commissioned to teach *infallibly* Christs Verities, of such Pastors I speak, and not of your street men? Or, can à Sectary be à member conjoyned with Gods word? It is impossible, for to say, *Sectary*, is to suppose him separated from *God's word*, which therefore destroys your Imagined *infallible conjunction*, and makes your Speculation not *admirable*, but *ridiculous*. Again, and here is à solution to the Argument (more amply laid forth *Disc. 3. c. 3. n. 17. 19.* and before that *c. 2. n. 12*). A conjunction with truth or Gods word, necessarily implies in this present State, a conjunction with the Church, for without the Testimony of this Oracle previously assented to, we have no infallible assurance that such books are *divinely inspired*, or what the sense of them is in all controverted passages, therefore to suppose an Infallible conjunction *with truth, or God's word* independently of Church-authority, is to suppose light taken from darkness; or the last *Resolvent of Faith* in order to us, not to ground it at all. But saith the
Dr, the

A conjunction with God's word implies Union with the Church,

Another
difficulty
Solved.

192 Part. 1. c. 8. More of the Dr's discourse, &c.
Dr, the Question is whether such à Prelate or
Pastor may be divided from God's infallible
truth? If he can, what security hath anyone
to rely upon him, upon such à conditional Infal-
libility, whereof he can have no assurance? I
answer, the common received Doctrin
of the Church being known, and divul-
ged in every Catechism, it is easily
known when à Renegado, such an one as
the Bishop of Spalato was, abandon's
the Church. In case of any rational
mistrust or doubt (because wolves so-
metimes appear like lambs) Prudence
direct's timorous Consciencés to advise
with their Pastors, or others, more lear-
ned then themselves.

Of the Dr's
vain applau-
ding him-
self.

16 P. 415. The Dr applauds his
good fortune in meeting with an Ad-
versary, that mistakes his so well expli-
cated *Rational Evidence* of Christian Re-
ligion, and à long talk followes of *beavers*
of difficulties, and *water-drawers*, of the
Seraphims feathers, and *S. Laurenc's Gridiron*,
to what purpose I know not. My hope
is before this next Chapter be ended
to make it manifest, that the Dr neither
understand's what is meant by *rational*
Evidence, nor has any thing like it, for
Protestant Religion.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Dr Stilling : pretended Evidence for Christian Religion proved nothing like Evidence. His Evidence taken from Sense in the Mystery of the holy Eucharist demonstrated Senseless. How vainly he endeavour's to prove by Miracles related in Scripture the Truth of the Doctrin there registred. A word of his Tradition, and many other errors.

THe Dr P. 416, goes about to explain what is meant by his rational Evidence of Christian Religion, and ground's it upon the *unquestionable assurance which we have of matters of fact*, and the *Miracles wrought by Christ*, as a great part of this rational Evidence, which is destroyed by our Doctrin of Transubstantiation. Soon after he complain's of our silent passing over these things, *the Schools having found no answers to such Arguments*. What will not this man say in points remote from us, when in a plain matter of fact, he beguiles his Reader with most loud un-

The Dr's unworthby proceeding,

N

truths?

truths? Let any one peruse my last Treatise. *Disc. 1. c. 9. n. 11. 12.* In that Discourse of à Heathen with à Christian, he will find the first difficulty largely handled, and solved, where I say, the Dr either believes our Saviours unparallled Miracles, because Scripture relates them, and then he suppoles Scripture *to be Divine or inspired by the Holy Ghost*, which the Heathen denies, and therefore wishes that Divine inspiration to be proved by Arguments extrinsical to the Doctrin delivered in Scripture. Or, contrarywise, he proves those Miracles to have been, upon the *Fallible report* of men liable to errour (the Dr own's no Tradition Infallible) and this advances not his cause at all, for do not the Turk's speak as much of Mahomets Miracles, upon fallible and perhaps false reports also? Thus the Heathen argues, and rationally too, not yet knowing what Religion to embrace. Here in à word you have the substance of all I then said, and I think my Argument thus delivered convinces. *Whoever proves Christian Religion to be assuredly true by Motives as obscure as the very Doctrin of Christian Religion is,* either evinces nothing, or makes à vicious Circle; But thus the Dr proceeds, whose rational Evidence, or unquestionable assurance of Christian Religion is proved by

An Argu-
ment propo-
sed.

by matters of fact, *Miracles I mean*, wrought by Christ, which *Miracles*, are as obscure to a Heathen, and as much objects of Faith to Christians, as the very Doctrin of Christ is, recorded in Scripture, Therefore he proves nothing. See more hereof, n. 12. cited.

2 The other piece of the Dr's rational Evidence taken from Sense which he thinks the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* destroys, I then reflected on, and fully answered. *Reas. and Relig: c. 12. n. 3.* where I say the immediate object of Sense, remain's after consecration unchanged, as before. It is true, reason upon the suggestion of sense might well conclude, that the substance of bread is there also, were there not another *stronger Principle* than sense which overawes us, Christ's own words, *This is my body*: which cause reason to submit. Thus *S. Chrysostom. S. Cyril of Hierusalem* with innumerable ancient Fathers, cited in that Chapter, yielded up their reason, notwithstanding that strong insinuation of sense to the Contrary. And must not the Dr do so also, had he either seen our Lord Jesus a little Infant in Bethlem, or those Angels that appeared to Lot. *Genesis 19*? He would certainly have judged upon the suggestion

The Drs Argument taken from the Holy Eucharist, both here and formerly, Solved.

suggestion of what he saw, that Christ our Lord was only man, and not God, and that those Angels were mortal men, and not Angels, yet had he then known by *Divine Revelation*, that Christ was truly God, and that those Angels were only men in appearance, as the Eucharist is seemingly bread, would he not, think ye, forthwith have rejected that fallacious suggestion of his sight, and firmly assented to the Divine Revelation? Nay more, doth not the Dr tell us in his *Account* P. 574. that we are not to look on bread and wine as naked Signs but as *Signa efficacia*, and that there is a *real Presence of Christ*, *in* and *with*, those signs to the Souls of the Believers? This unexplicated Presence of Christ *in*, and *with* bread (be it what you will) is as much contrary to Sence, as Christs real Presence is, under the accidents of bread. I prove my assertion. These outward Accidents of bread either essentially exclude the presence of all other things from being there, or permit that God may by his omnipotent power put under them another Substance. In case they be essentially incompatible with any other Substance but bread, how dare Dr Still tell us so asseverantly, that there is *in* and *with* bread to the souls of Believers

vers, à real presence of Christ? such Souls i suppose believe not meer phan-
sies. Now if the Accidents essentially
exclude not another substance, I hope
Christ's sacred body may be as well pre-
sent with them as that real presence is,
which the Dr assert's. O! but we
Catholicks destroy the substance of
bread. That is not at all pertinent to
our present purpose, neither doth the
truth hereof belong to the judgement
of sense, but only to Gods omnipotent
power, For here is the only difficulty,
whether God by his absolute power can
conceal the real presence of our Saviours
sacred body under the Accidents of
bread? The Diuel more skilful in na-
tural things then the Dr, perswaded him-
self. *Mat: 4.* that our Saviour could
turn stoves into bread. Why therefore
may not we believe upon the greatest
Authority, I mean God's own express word,
that he changed bread into flesh? The
learnedest Protestants that ever writ
boggle not at the possibility of this change,
but only Question the matter of fact,
whether God has done, as we believe?
Wherein most certainly we have the
upper hand, if plain Scripture, the general
consent of Fathers, and the Authority of all
Orthodox Churches cited in the last Trea-

*Protestants
boggle not
at the possi-
bility of the
change.*

rise, may plead our cause, and be admitted as sound *Principles* against the error of à few Sectaries. Thus much premised we goe on, and will examin more of the Dr's strange Discourse laid forth in, his *Account. Part. 1. c. 5. P. 118.* It is worth some reflection, though I think never Dr rambled on like him.

3 The whole substance comes to this. *Sense is sometimes deceived*, or to speak properly, *reason upon the suggestion of sense err's*: Ergo, it may alwaies err and be deceived, in its proper object. Or thus: Thole of Sodom judged Angels appearing like men, to be really men, and not Angels, Ergo, they might rationally think that all they met with in the Streets, were Angels concealed under the outward shape of men, Why so? Because, forsooth, after that one Illusion, they were in reason never to make use of their senses afterward upon any other object for fear of the like deceit. Herein lies the whole strength of the Dr's weak talk. If saith he, *what I se and all others se to be bread, be not really bread, by what means can our faculties difference truth from falshood?* I answer most easily. For although it be à truth, that, that which appear's bread in the Holy Eucharist be not

The whole
Strength of
the Dr's
weak dis-
course

not really bread, yet it is à meer dream to infer from thence, that every mountain I cast my eyes upon, is not really à Mountain, but in appearance only, and consequently in the Dr's judgement à falshood, for what Consequence is this? God wrought à Miraculous change upon bread, therefore He doth the like all the world over, and perhaps changes whole Castles, whole Towns, yea the whole Ocean into other substances; at least there is no security to the contrary, and therefore we may all justly question whether we inhabit real Houses, and doubt whether the fair City of London be raised to the great splendour it hath upon real Materials, as wood and stones, but rather upon such Materials, in appearance. A mad discourse if ever any was, which more ruin's all the Cities in the world, then the last dismal fire destroyed noble London.

4 Mark well, Courteous Reader, the force of my Argument, I do not by what is hitherto said goe about to prove the Conversion of bread into Christ's sacred body (*that is cleared upon other grounds*) but only proceed upon à Supposition. *What is to be noted in my Argument.*
and

and assert, if, our Saviour wrought that Conversion and changed bread into his body, The Dr's Discourse is worse then Nonsense, *who out of one Miraculous change* (where he thinks our senses are beguiled) will force upon us an illusion *so universal*, that no man hereafter ought to trust his eyes, and tast, when he eats his Diner. Herein lies his gross mistake, which yet to his no little disgrace, he run's on with, in the following Instances.

The Dr's
Instances.

5 Tell me, saith he, *what assurance could the Apostles have of the Resurrection of Christ's individual body from the grave, but the judgement of Sense? Or, had S. Thomas believed Transubstantiation, might he not have thought our Saviour some invisible Spirit hid under those external accidents of his body, because, Hoc est corpus meum had told him, and the other Disciples, that the external accidents might remain, where the substance is changed?* I passe by his Catacrexis, judgement of sense, for sense makes no Judgement, and say, had the Disciples been so childish as to have argued like the Dr our wise Saviour would have soon vanquished that senseless plea and told them. My good Disciples, I assured you at my last supper, that the bread I took into my hands, I changed into my body (this must

must be supposed, or Dr Still: Argument becomes forceles) but did I ever yet tell you, that the body you now behold with your Eyes is only à *Spectre*, or an apparition of my body? No? upon what ground then, or by what Authority, can you rationally infer out of my working one miracle upon bread, that I must do the like now upon my own body risen from the dead? You have none. Therefore rely boldly on your senses and reason also, and judge me to be the same Individual Saviour I was before. For there is no Principle natural or revealed which contradict's this belief, or that enjoynes you to deny your Senses either in this, or any other *sensible object*. But for the change of bread into my body, you have my express words, the world hereafter will profess that truth all over Christianity, my Church shall maintain it, the best Christians upon earth believe it, Innumerable Martyrs shall dy for it, undeniable Miracles confirm it, and the most learned Doctors that ever lived, shall leave this my Doctrin upon Record to the utter confusion of all Hereticks. The Dr may demand upon what ground can I imagin that our Saviour would have argued thus against his Disciples? I answer,

How Christ might have rebuked his Disciples, had they pleaded like the Dr.

answer, my ground is incomparably more sure, than any the Dr can give, or endeavour to perswade by, that the Apostles were ever so sottish as to have thought of his ridiculous Obiection, For all I say here are Truths owned over Christendom and worthy to be spoken by our Saviour, but his Obiection never wise or Orthodox man seriously proposed, before himself.

*The Dr's
Tautologies:*

6 What followes in the Dr is no more but one Tautologie after another, Or the same thing (already casheired) said too often over. *When, saith he, the assurance of Christian Religion came from the judgement of the Senses of those who were Eye-witnesses of the Miracles, and the Resurrection of Christ, if the Senses of men may be so grossly deceived in the proper objects of them in the case of Transubstantiation, what assurance could they have who were Eye-witnesses of them?* A long period with many falsities, to no purpose. I have answered to what here import's, that though our senses be deceived in the case of Transubstantiation (which is not true) yet we have as much certainty in every other thing we se or feel, as the Dr hath when he sees or feels the pulpit he preaches in, Vnless this Sequel be allowed of: *My eyes are once deceived (if yet so) ergo, they must alwaies be deceived.*

*and weak
way of argu-
ing*

ceived. Or, à Jugler can make me se what is not, ergo, I never se what is. Again saith he. Take away the certainty of the judgement of sense, you destroy all certainty in Religion. I have answered. We neither take away the Object of sense, nor like well his miscalled judgement of sense, for sense hath still its own proper object, though were it otherwise in this Mystery, his Inference of all certainty destroyed has no Sence in it. 3. Saith the Dr. I must by virtue of your Churches Infallibility believe something to be true, which if it be true, there can be no certainty at all of the truth of Christian Religion. This is only the some thing needlessly repeated, already answered. And so is that which some others do object. If the sense of seeing be deceived, so likewise may the sense of hearing, and consequently none can have assurance of what either Christ spake, or the Church teaches. Who can read this stuff with patience? Yet it is gravely set forth in Sermons as most weighty, and convincing, and which is worse, thought worthy to appear in Print.

7 The Solution of all in à word is. Our senses in this Mystery are not deceived, nor so much beguiled as the eye is, when we se à straight stick crooked in the water, for here the Medium makes that to appear crooked
which

The Drs
repeated
Objections

slowly
solved,

which is not, there in the Eucharist, the immediate object of sense is seen as before, without the least Illusion. Yet grant, which is not true, à deception here, it is à folly above expression to infer that our senses are beguiled in every other object set before our eyes, and this the Dr must prove, or he evinces nothing. Thus much noted, I challenge and charge the Dr to discover in his next Answer any thing like à fallacy in my whole Discourse. But when will this be done think ye? Then I say (and not sooner) when the Dr makes this Consequence good. *If Christ changed bread, retaining the outward semblance of bread into his own body;* we may prudently judge, that he also changed those stones the Diavel threw'd him. *Mat: 4.* into good bakers bread, though outwardly they still appeared stones. The first change is grounded upon as great Authority as any Mystery of Faith is. (none excepted) For the second, we have nothing but fancy only. Now if after all I have said, the Dr as his usual custome hath been, silently passes by my reasons hitherto alledged, and only tells his old stories over again of our senses being deceived &c. I shall retort his own words upon him, and conclude, that

If the Dr
tell his old
stories over
again, he
will be cal-
led à Bum-
gler.

that his School find's no answer to my Arguments.

8 Another grand errour of this Dr is, that he attributes more to the Evidence of sense in order to its proper object (à visible Miracle for example) than can be allowed. The Sense of seing (take this for an Instance, the like is of feeling hearing &c) is only terminated upon the outward appearance of things, and, as it penetrat's not the substance of the bread, so neither see's it the inward life or motion of the Soul in à mortal body. Whence it followes, though we grant that Sense is never beguiled, as to its proper object, yet it often gives occasion of deceit in other matters, wholly out of the reach of sense. You shall se what I here hint at by one Instance. Suppose the Dr saw the Divil, that often transform's himself into an Angel of light doing his feates, to delude the senses with à false Miracle, or, if he denies Divels, he must grant that power to Antichrist, who will shew many seeming wonders. Suppose this be one, *that à man in outward appearance* dead to all senses by Antichrists Charms, stand's up again, and moves as others do. I ask, how will the Dr who gives so much credit to his eyes and senses distinguish by Sense only between
between

tween the true refuscitation of *Lairu* daughter Luke. 8. 55. and this counterfeit Miracle of Antichrist? In his Principles he cannot difference them, if guided by the *Evidence of sense* and all that reason Can discover by Sense only.

*The Dr by
virtue of his
own Princi-
ple, must
own Anti-
christ's Mi-
racles, for
true Mira-
cles.*

9 Hence to take off the Dr's, errour, as to the Blessed Sacrament, we discourse further. He judges what he see's in a consecrated Host to be truly bread, because his eyes and senses tell him it is bread. These the Dr thinks give in stronger Evidence for its being bread, than any proof to the contrary, can persuade, that it is not bread. Yeild this (and the Dr yeilds all) He is obliged to own this seeming Miracle of Antichrist for à true Miracle, because his eyes and senses will have it true, I prove it? The exteriour Evidence in both Cases is the very Same, for as sense see's and feel's this man to be like one truly dead, *though he is not dead*, So it also see's and feel's this wafer after Consecration to be like true bread, *though it be not bread*, and reason, as I now said, purely led on by the conduct of sense judges alike in both cases, therefore if the Dr Conform's his Judgement to the perswasion of his senses in the one, and truly hold's à consecrated host to be bread, he cannot

cannot but upon the same Evidence Judge, that Antichrist's Miracle is à true Miracle. No disparity can be given. O! but Scripture so often forewarning us of Antichrist's false Miracles, much abates, yea wholly withdrawes every sound Christian from believing *them true*. Is it possible? Can Scripture let in so much light upon us? Can it make us to deny what *our eyes see*, and *fingers feel*, to be true? Why therefore cannot the clearest words that Christ ever Spake. *This is my body My flesh is meat indeed. My blood is drink indeed*, force us to deny the weak suggestion of our Senses called by the Dr, *the Strongest Evidence*? Why should not those Sacred words move us Submissively to confels, that as no real Miracle lies under that outward guise of Antichrist's apparent wonder, (Scripture drawes us to own this truth) So no real bread lies under the outward appareance or visible forms of bread and wine, or if Scripture work's so powerfully upon us as not to believe that to be bread which to our Senses looks like bread, where in is Our offence greater than the Dr's, who believes that to be no true Miracle which to our Senses looks like a true one?

In

*What plain
Scripture
forces on us
to believe in
the blessed
Sacrament.*

In a word the Dr must either quit his so much cryed up *Evidence* taken from *Sense*, or will be forced to grant(which is horrid) that Antichrist Shall work as true Miracles as ever Christ wrought.

10 Again, how can the Dr Assert that Christ's Miracles wrought before the writing of Scripture, were done to confirm all the Doctrin registred by S. Paul, and the other Disciples afterward? Nay, how can he prove they were wrought to confirm the truth of our Saviours own Doctrin without giving some further proof, then the *outward sights* of a *Miracle*, is? Hence I said the Dr erred, when he told us that *the assurance of Christian Religion came from the judgement of the senses of those who were Eye-witnesses of the Miracles, and the Resurrection of Christ.* First no Eye-witnesses saw our Saviour actually rysing from the dead(but afterward) yet had they seen him in that instant, can the Dr judge that the assurance of the Apostles Faith came from *that sight*? Doth he or any ground Faith upon the sight of those who beheld Christs Miracles, while the very best Eye-witnesses believed not, because they saw them, but upon this strong *Motive*, that *Christ told them he was sent from God to teach eternal truth*, and that now risen
he

he was the same Saviour, who had been dead. Gods Infallible word therefore (rightly called Divine Revelation, not *seen by any mortal eye*) grounded the Apostles Faith, and so it likewise doth all true Christian Faith in the world to this day. Now if the Dr tell us, when he saies the assurance of Christian Religion came from the *judgement of sense*, his meaning only was, that the sight of those Miracles were *Inducements* to believe Christ's revealed Doctrin, and made that (not evidently seen) *evidently credible*, He first speaks improperly in calling those visible matters of fact the *Foundations of Faith* (*Account P. 119*), And. 2. destroyes the certainty of Christian Doctrin, by endeavouring to prove it *immediatly true*, before he evinces it *evidently credible*: And this he doth by introducing a new set of Motives (different from those of the Catholick Church) which both Jewes and Gentils scorn, and in reallity neither evidence *the Truth* to *such men*, nor the *Credibility* of Christian Religion, much lesse have any reference to the *Thing* he calls Protestancy, as will appear afterward.

11 To make my Assertion good, turn, courteous Reader, to the Doctors *Account. Part. 1. c. 7. P. 204*, where he

O

offer's

Divine
Faith relies
not upon the
sights of a
Miracle,

offer's to resolve the Faith of Protestants, though he never meddl's with the Novelty, as I have largely proved, *Protest: without Princ. Disc.* 1. c. 9. In this place I am to shew, that his Discourse tend's to the ruin of true Christian Religion also, Supposing, what he will have with all might and main Supposed, that there is no Infallible Church.

the Dr's
discourse de-
scribed in
his own
words.

12 There are, saith he, three Questions to be resolved in the resolution of Faith. *First if I be asked, on what grounds I believe the things to be true, which are contained in Scripture?* My answer must be from the greatest evidence of truth, which things of that nature are capable of. If therefore the persons who are supposed to have writ those things, were such who were fully acquainted with what they writ of, and cannot be suspected of any design to deceive men by their writings, and if I be certain that these which go under the name of their writings are undoubtedly theirs, I have sufficient grounds to believe the truth of them. He add's more. These writers cannot be suspected of ignorance, for they writ these things when the story was new, and some of them had been conversant with the person and actions of him, whom they writ of. That they could have no intent

to deceive, appear's from their simplicity and Candour both of their actions and writings, from their contempt of the world, and exposing themselves to the greatest hazards to bear witness to them. Finally, that these writings have been unanimously received by Christians and never doubted of by Jewes ^{His pretended} or Heathen Philosopher. Thus the Dr ^{ded rational} plead's for the evidence of the first act ^{evidence for} of Faith, whereby he believes those ^{the first act} things true which are contained in Scripture.

I quote his Doctrin more at large, not ~~in~~ to leave it unexamined as he usually doth mine, but to shew the unreasonableness of it, while he makes all along a bare Supposition his best and only proof. Or speak thus and you fully express all he saies. Some body wrote the things contained in Scripture, Ergo all that appear's there, is true, because written.

13 To prove by reason that the things contained in Scripture are true, he first begins with *If*s. *If* the persons who are supposed to have written such things were fully acquainted with what they wrote of. *If* they cannot be suspected of any design to deceive men. *If* it be certain that such writings are theirs &c. Observe, I beseech you: These conditional Propositions carry no other weight with them,

evidenced
null, and
forceless,

them, but thus much only, if *what is supposed True, be true, it is true, and we ought to assent to it.* Just as if one should say; if Peter be a man of his word, I may believe him, but as that *conditional* proves not Peter honest, no more do these Assertions of the Dr being only conditional, prove any thing true without a *Minor* to this sence. *But these things are so, which Minor is wanting.* The Dr think's he proves his Assertions upon these grounds; *That the Writers of Scripture cannot be suspected of Ignorance, having had long conversation with him they wrot of. Their simplicity and candour in writing gives evidence they intended no deceipt, with all the rest that followes.* I answer, these are nothing like *rational proofs*, but meer unproved Suppositions, *whereunto neither Jewes nor Gentils give credit.* I evince this demonstratively. Put the book of holy Scripture into the hands of a Heathen Philosopher, who never heard of Christ, of the Church, or of any other Motive for Christian Religion, but only takes so much as the Dr here proposes, and *what the Scripture it selfe barely relates.* Would this Philosopher, think ye, after his pondering the Drs Discourse and reading Scripture, forthwith acquiesce and say all is true, he reads?

He

He were worse then besotted did he so. If prudent he would tell you, he had joyntly perused with *Scripture* the *Turks Alcaron*, and as he found strange wonders written of Christ in the one book, so also he met with great matters recounted of Mahomet in the other, for which the Turks pretend to have universal tradition, but whether *Scripture* or the *Alcaron* speaks truth, whether such men, as the Dr mentions related exactly the Miracles of Christ, and his true *Doctrin* with those Miracles, the Philosopher knowes not, nor shall ever know, without à further proof taken from the testimony of some other *Infallible Oracle*, which makes the truths in *Scripture* evidently credible, and then proposes all, as *Divine and infallible Verities*.

14 The ultimate reason hereof is most convincing. All matters contained in *Scripture*, whether *Miracles* or *Doctrin*, are not *ex terminis* any Self evidence, nor can they give by themselves, so much as à great moral certainty of their *Truth*, or *Credibility*. Therefore they must be proved either true or evidently *Credible* by another Certain Oracle, or can never draw belief from any. I am sure S. Austin, who discoursed more profoundly, than the Dr ever did, judged

The reason of their nullity, said forth,

So, when he told the Manichæes, *He would not believe the Gospel unless the Authority of the Church moved him to believe it*, and upon this firm ground all must believe, or believe nothing. The Dr's whole discourse proves only this conditional truth, that if the Primitive Christians had reason to believe the Doctrine of Christ, upon the inducement of his Miracles, they did well to believe, but that such Miracles were wrought he shewes not, save only by *Scripture it selfe*, hitherto neither proved *True*, nor *Divine*. *I say proved*. For no Christian doubt's of the truths there contained, though all justly question whether the Dr makes them to *appear Truths*, by à bare telling us of some Contents in that book, which neither Jew nor Gentil, nor indeed any can believe, unless more be said than the Dr brings to light.

Wherein
the Dr's
error lies?

15 In à word, here lies the whole error. He makes the Christian Doctrine couched in *Scripture to prove it selfe*, and draws *his rational Evidence of Credibility from the Mysteries believed*. Observe well. He believes the Resurrection of Christ from the dead (for this is an Article of Faith) can he, I beseech you, make the Resurrection it self, *as believed*,
the

the rational Motive of believing it, while after all his discourse, we are yet to seek for a proof of that very Scriptures Truth, and Divinity also, whereby the Resurrection is attested?

16 The Dr may reply, his evidence is not taken from the *Mysteries of Faith*, ^{as faith} and from our Saviours Miracles, (the ^{reply} like is of Apostolical wonders) as they ^{seen, and} are believed, but from the *Humane consent* ^{prevented.} of the *Primitive Christians*, who either saw or heard of such matters of fact wrought by Christ and his Apostles, which common consent passing among so many grave and pious men, made them in those dayes evidently Credible, and Morally certain though we abstract from all *Divine Revelation* in Scripture, and the *Churches Infallible Authority*. I answer first, if the Dr run's this way, his whole discourse fastidiously spun out against the Miracles of the *Roman Catholick Church*, fall's to nothing; for, if the common humane consent of the ancient Christians (*Supposed neither Divine Revelation nor infallible*) raised our Saviours Miracles to Moral certainty, or evident Credibility, Then, why should not the like common humane ^{The com-} Consent of Christians Now, make the ^{mon consent} Miracles ^{of the an-} ^{cient Chri-} ^{stians and} ^{modern, for} ^{Miracles} parallel'd

What Jewes
may object.

Miracles owned in the Roman Catholick Church, *morally certain, or evidently credible?* And I speak of Miracles approved by the Church, not of every forged tale, or pretended false wonder, which were not wanting in the Primitive times. If therefore the Dr say, that all since the Apostles dayes have been grossly deluded in recounting the Miracles wrought in the Catholick Church, both Jewes and Gentils will shrewdly pester him, and avouch as boldly, that those Primitive Christians, *over Credulous*, (like papists in these dayes) were no less beguiled in their *crying up* Apostolical Miracles. What say you to this Mr Dr? The parity taken from the primitive times and *ours*, I shall urge more fully hereafter, and tell the Dr, he shall long sweat at it, before he solves what I here object, if, which is ever to be noted, we stand only upon a *common humane consent* of men called Christians, and abstract from the Authority of an Infallible Church.

What is here
chiefly en-
quired?

17 I answer. 2. The enquiry here made, concern's not only the bare truth of these *matters of fact* recorded in Scripture, *but implies more*, for we ask how these matters of fact are rationally proved *truths* written by the *Assistance of the Holy Ghost*,

Ghost, or how, (when supposed wrought sixteen Ages since), they are now conveyed and applyed to us, *as Truths of so high a nature* ? No common consent of Christians, *meerly humane* and long since past, can give *Sufficient certainty hereof*; *sufficient*, I say, to ground *Divine Faith*. Wherefore seeing Scripture evidences not it's *own truths*, nor any reflection made upon Scripture can clear these doubts, an infallible living Oracle manifested by supernatural Signs must speak, and tell us, that these matters of fact were written, not like other things in *humane History* (which are lyable to error) but by the special direction and *inspiration* of the Holy Ghost.

18 Hence we proceed to the second Question. *If saith the Dr, I be asked why I believe the Doctrin contained in those books to be Divine* ^{The Dr's second question proposed.} I answer. 1. *That in the 1st. Age, when the Doctrin was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it Divine.* He goes on. *Supposing then, that we already believe upon the former answer, that if Christ did such unparalleld Miracles, and rose from the dead, they who heard his Doctrin, had reason to believe it to be of God.* He mean's *Divine* and revealed Doctrin, for all Doctrin of God, or from God, is not in *our Sense* now, *Divine* or revealed Doctrin.

Thus

our excep-
tions made
against his
evidence

Thus much said, He asserts. 2. *If they, the ancient Christians, had reason then, we have so now. Vix.* to believe upon our Saviours unparalleld Miracles. From these matters of fact and Apostolical wonders, the Dr takes his rational Evidence, and conveigh's it to *us by Tradition, which supplies the want of our Senses, as to what Christ did and spake.* I shall presently insist more largely. n. 26. upon his Tradition. Here I am to show, that his Evidence in order to Christians *now living*, is nothing like *rational Evidence*, if (and this he requires) we exclude the Testimony of an Infallible Church.

where the
main diffi-
culty is ?

19 To propose plainly what I would say, and to give the Dr the fairest play imaginable, I *gratis* admit, all the Miracles and matters of fact recorded in the Gospel to be most true, though hitherto *not proved true by the Dr*, but then ask, what use will he make of them? He may answer, he proves by these Miracles the Doctrin of Christ to be true. Admit this also. I demand further, and here *lies the main business* that concern's us at present, whether the Doctor can assure any by virtue of those Miracles, who at this day, *among so many dissenting Christians in points of Faith* most

most *fundamental*, believe and profess Christ's true Doctrin? For his *rational Evidence* if it deserve the Title of *rational*, must drive hither at last, or its worth nothing to Christians now living, that is, he must shew by these long since wrought Miracles, whether *Arians*, *Pelagians*, *Protestants*, or *Catholicks* have à right beliefe of Christs Doctrin, for most certainly all of them believe not the *true Doctrin delivered by Christ*? I say it is impossible to make this out, unless the strangest Consequence that ever man heard of be good, and it's thus. Christ rose from the dead. He commanded the sea and winds, and they obeyed his voice, He gave life to dead Lazarus &c. Ergo the *Arians*, for example, profess Christ's true Doctrin, and *Protestants* not: Or Contrarywise, *Protestants* believe right, and the *Arians* are in a wrong Faith? Unless this Inference, which is worse than Non-sence, pass current, the Doctors pretended rational Evidence taken from those ancient matters of fact, is the most fruitless, and most *discomfutable* Evidence that ever wise man pitch't upon, whereof more presently. n. 27.

Note

*the Dr's va-
sional Evi-
dence do-
monstrated
useless, to
Christians
now living*

Note in the mean while, he may perhaps (and no more but perhaps) tell us by his Evidence, that Christs Doctrin *in it self* is true, but shall never thereupon assure us, who among so many Dissenters in Necessaries to Salvation, *believes or professes that true Doctrin*. He may tell us that horrid debates arise amongst the learned of different Religions, but shall never tell us, how they can be composed or ended by à *bare owning the truth of Christ's Miracles*, which are carried up and down by à *common humane consent* of Christians, though they have none to attest them Infallibly true, in this present State.

20 Please now to consider, how differently we Catholicks proceed in this matter, and satisfy both Jewes and Gentils. We own all that Scripture contain's whether Miracles or Doctrin, *true and Divine*. To evince this, we lead you not to à dead book, or to matters of fact *far off*, but to an ever living Oracle, distinct from that book, called the *Holy Catholick Church*, which proves herselfe by her *neerer visible* matters of fact, (signal marks, and undoubted Miracles) as rationally à *true Oracle*, whereby God speak's to the world, as ever any Apostle did. From this glorious, signalized, and
long

long standing Church, we take *our rational Evidence* and know, if the Primitive Christians took theirs right from the *Apostolical Wonders*, we no way Inferiour, keep parallel with them, while we *rationaly* rely upon our clear manifested Oracle. Moreover, we prove that this Church which hath power from God to teach, and engages her whole Authority to *teach Truth*, shewes herselfe by real Signs and Miraculous effects, the greatest Oracle now under God, appointed to instruct the world. It is She, if Controversies arise concerning Faith, that composes all. She assures us that the verities in Scripture, written by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost, are *Divine*. She *applies and conveys* these ancient truths to us. She tells us now, and Infallibly, what Christ's Doctrin (long since made evidently Credible by his own most glorious Miracles) is. She finally ascertain's every one *without doubt and hesitancy*, who they are that profess this revealed Doctrin. And thus relying upon a *rational evidenced Church*, we Shew our selves rational men, and void of fear set our hearts at rest, while the Dr by a bare relation of our Saviours Miracles, now remote from us, proves not one of these particulars, but will, forsooth,

*How diffi-
culty we
proceed from
the Dr in
our rational
Evidence.*

forsooth, evince the Doctrin in Scripture to be Divine upon à *meer unproved Supposition*, that such matters of fact once were, which yet cannot be evinced true (sufficient as I said to ground Faith) much less *Divine*, without the Churches Testimony, whereby full assurance is given to all in this present State, that both Doctrin and Miracles are *true* and *Divine*.

what the Dr
should aim at,
as, but per-
form's not.

21 The Dr therefore, should in the first place have proved the Divinity of Christ's Doctrin, and from thence he might have inferred *it's Truth*, but to evince it Divine to Christians now, upon à *meer unproved Supposition*. *Viz.* That such matters of fact are true, is a break-neck to his Discourse, and an unapproachable way of ever coming to the Conclusion he intend's, because his aime must be, or he doth nothing, to show by *his Evidence*, what Society of Christians now living, believes and professes the true Doctrin of Christ; or how Christ's true Society may be made discernable by those ancient Miracles from others, that teach damnable Doctrin. Herein he fail's, and shall fail, while an Infalible Church is rejected.

22 These Considerations clearly laid down, no less clearly evince the Dr's resolution of Faith to be *frivolous*, and his rational

rational Evidence, *unreasonable*, for tell me not by his *Evidence*, what Society of Christians are now right in Faith, **prove** me not, that Scripture was written by Divine assistance, Shew me not, that the truths related there, are *Truths revealed* by Almighty God, the whole Doctrin of that book, and all the Miracles in it, signify nothing.

23 Again, those ancient Miracles though supposed true, are far from giving any undubitable assurance by their *Sights alone* without further light, that such was, *and yet is the genuin and pure Sence of God's* word, for how many thousands are there now in the world, who willingly own all the Miracles wrought by Christ, and yet are at implacable discord concerning the *true meaning* of what our Saviour and his Apostles taught, which strifes cannot be ended by a bare owning those Miracles *true*, but by the Infallible Decision of an ever living manifested Church. *I say manifested* by Miracles and other weighty Motives, that laid before mans rational Power, led it on to believe *in Christ*, and *his Church*, for these two Articles go together, and are proposed in the *Creed*, as necessary *believable Verities*. *I believe in Jesus Christ. I believe the Holy Catholick Church.* As therefore to believe all that Christ

*Christ was
manifested
by rational
Motives and
so is the
Church.*

Christ taught, confessedly required the light of *glorious Motives*, whereby his Doctrin was made *Credible to reason* so also to believe what the Church teaches, requires the like light, or an answerable evident Credibility, grounded on convincing and rational Motives. I desired the *Dr Reas: and Relig: Disc: 3. c. 16. n. 28.* to consider, how cold and faint Christian Faith would have grown in the hearts of men before this day, had all Church Motives fail'd or ceased, soon after the Apostles preaching: Had no more Conversions been wrought, no more Martyrs dyed for God's truth, no more contempt of the world been evidenced in thousands and thousands, and finally, had no other Miracles been don in after Ages, but such only, as the Scripture relates? It is therefore open impiety in the Dr to slight all Church Motives and her Miracles, calling them à *grand Salade* too often served up. It is worse then Perverness, to tell us as he doth in his last book. *P. 665. That the Doctrin of Christ and his Apostles being confirmed by Miracles wrought by them, there can be no such necessity in succeeding Ages to confirm the same Doctrin by Miracles.* I have answered this very Obiection. *Reas. and Relig: Disc: 2. c. 7.* and shewed the Continuation

*The Continuation of
Miracles,
proved
necessary.*

tion of Miracles in the Church both useful and necessary, not only because our Saviour foretold they should be done. *John. 12*, but upon this account also, *that the Conversion of Infidels to Christ*, was wrought as well in the Ages after the Apostles, as when those blessed men preached to the world. If therefore, the first Apostolical Miracles were necessary to convince unbelieving Jews and Gentils *Then*, it is plain ungodliness to deem them fruitless *Now*, when God is pleased to work them by Missioners lawfully sent to convert as Barbarous Nations, as ever S. Paul preach't to.

24. Again, Miracles most evidently have been wrought, and very frequently, I ask for what end did God concur with his Servants to do them? No other reason can with probability fall into mens minds but this, That *an infinite Power and wisdom intended thereby* to make his Church glorious, and to induce the most obdurate hearts to believe her Doctrine. The Dr yet seems not satisfied, for he thinks the conveyance of the Apostolical Miracles being wrought for the benefit of succeeding Ages, may well serve the turn in all after Times without more. If with this man were sent with his Bible to some Barbarians in America, who

*The end of
God's Con-
curring with
his servants
to work
Miracles.*

never perhaps heard of *Christ* or *Scripture*, and only read them such Miracles as Scripture relates, without working any himselfe, as S. Xaverius and other Missioners have done. How many think ye would the Dr draw to Christ, if he told his Hearers, that *all the certainty* men have of those ancient Miracles and Christ's Doctrin comes from fallible Tradition, which may be false? My thought is, he would convert this way very few, or rather none at all. Let others judge as they please. Now because the main ground whereon he relies is his much driven in, conveyance by Tradition, we will bestow a little pains upon it, and shew, if ever man lost himselfe in a Labyrinth, it is Dr Stillingfleet.

Of the Dr's error in conveying to us by Tradition, what Christ did, and spake.

25 **T**He Substance of the Dr's Discourse (Accounts, P. 205) is thus: Tradition to us doth only supply the want of our senses, as to what Christ did, and spake, it being a perpetuated sensation, and of the same use to us now, as if we had been actually present with Christ, and seen his Miracles, or heard his Doctrin,

Doctrin, when he delivered it. Soon after, it is apparent that the use of the senses to those who saw Christs Miracles, and heard his Doctrin, was not to give any Credibility to either of them, but only to be the means of conveying them those things, which might induce them to believe. The same is Tradition now to us, it doth not in it selfe make the Doctrin more credible, but supplies the use of our senses in a certain conveyance of those things which were Motives to believe them. Hence he inferr's, That the motives to the primitive Christians and to us are the same, only the manner of conveyance, differ's. 2. He inferr's, as it was not then necessary for those who saw our Saviours Miracles wrought for the confirmation of his Doctrin, to have the inward Testimony of the Spirit, or any external Infallible Testimony of a Church, to assure them that those Miracles were really done by Christ, but God left them to the judgement of sense, so proportionably, neither of these two are now necessary for the resolution of Faith, but God instead of sense, leaves us to the evidence of Tradition. Thus the Dr, where you se his whole labour spent in vain, and a gross mistake with it, for he think's the main difficulty lies in the conveyance of the things written in Scripture to this Age, whereas the real difficulty is, to prove that there ever were any such things true, and written by Divine inspiration, as he supposes to be conveyed.

The substance of the Drs Discourse laid down in his own words.

He waves the real difficulty

Unlesse this particular be first rationally evinced, the Turks will dare to argue as the Dr doth. *In Mahomer's time there was reason to believe Mahomers Miracles and Wonders, Ergo, there is reason to believe them now*, because they are conveyed down by Tradition. And thus the followers of every false *Sectarie* may make any Religion true. But here is not all.

No man is
wiser by the
Dr's lame
Tradition,

26 Mark I beseech you, how pitifully the Dr shuffles. He own's à tradition which conveigh's unto us *what Christ did and spake*. That is, we may know by his fallible tradition received among Christians, that our Saviour wrought such Miracles, and spake such words, for example, *I and my Father are one. The word is made flesh. This is my body &c.* But how is any man wiser for that? How is our knowledge or faith improved by such à maimed or half perfect Tradition? While no man can certainly tell us, what the *true meaning* of those sacred words is. No man can determine the *debates* which arise among Christians (the Arians and you) that draw plain Contradictions out of these words, now cited. Such à conveyance or tradition as could end these long strifes, would be to your purpose and comfort, Mr Dr, but you have none of it, because

because you slight the Tradition and Authority of an Infallible Church. Though therefore you tell us twenty times over, you believe all truths expressed in Scripture, yet while you cannot assure us upon tradition, or any other *sound Principle*, what those necessary truths are, which Faith in *necessaries* is determinately to pitch upon, you only trifle away your time, and cheat your Reader, in seeming to discover *great matters*, whereas in real truth you speak not one word to the purpose. If, to solve the difficulty here briefly touched, you run up to your own *discerning faculty*, permit the Arian to keep you company and blame him not, if he trust to his *discerning faculty* quite contrary to yours. See more hereof above, Chap. 4. n. 10. Thus much premised.

How, the Dr Cheat's his Reader,

17 To answer the Dr I say first. Fallible Tradition which may be false (the Dr own's none Infallible) gives not so great certainty of Miracles *Supposed* true in Scripture, as *Eye-sight* did to those who beheld them. The reason is. Fallible Tradition in the Dr's Principles easily alters in time, and may tell one Story for another, whereof more presently. If therefore that Tradition conveyed by hearing altered, as I shall shew,

Our Answer to the Dr.

Fallible tra-
dition worth
little in Di-
vine matters

most shamefully (and if failible no wonder at the change) what certainty have we now in this present Age, either of the Miracles, or of the Doctrin recorded in Scripture by virtue of it? Or how can the Dr parallel the certainty of à Miracle conveyed down by fallible Tradition, with the sight of it? This must needs be à lame Parallel. For when I se à Miracle I need not to prove the outward *appearance of it* evidently seen, but when that appearance passes down Age after Age upon Hearsay, or à faltering Tradition which may change the Story from what it once was, I must either *prove that Tradition true*, or cannot prudently rely on it, chiefly in this present case, while we dispute against *Jewes and Gentils*, who utterly deny those Miracles to have ever been *truly* wrought by Christ. The ancient Jewes, all know, said Christ cast out Devils by the help of Beelzebub, and these modern men of the Synagogue calumniate as boldly to this day.

28 I say. 2. Those ancient Miracles (if saith à Jew, ever any such were) together with the Doctrin, which is thought to be proved *either true or evidently credible* by such wonders, can be no more certain now, than the fallible Tradition is, which conveighs them to us. But this Tradition gives no man so much

as moral certainty either of the *Miracles*
 or *Doctrin* : I prove the Minor. That The reason why worth-
 less in the
 Dr's Prin-
 ciples. The ancient Tradition, say Sectaries, noto-
 riously changed not long after the Apost-
 les dayes, when a universal deluge of errors
 spread it selfe the whole Chri-
 stian world over, and the efficacy of
 Christs true Doctrin together with its
 old Tradition, was blotted out of mens
 memory; when the Roman *Catholick* The Dr
 charges this
 Idolatry
 upon the
 Roman
 Church. Church once confessedly Orthodox, un-
 luckily began Her universal Apostacy,
 and professed open Idolatry; when the
Arians denyed the Mystery of the Incar-
 nation and Trinity; Others, the two
Wills in Christ, others his Sacred Huma-
 nity, others, the Resurrection of the dead,
 others the necessity of Divine Grace, and
 others finally professed yet more horrid
 Doctrins, In so much, that the whole
 Christian word, (part of it one way, part
 another) erred most grossly in the very
 fundamentals of Faith. In those dismal
 dayes say I, when all Christian Societies
 nameable, and the Roman Church with
 them became so infatuated as to change
 the first received truths taught by Christ
 and his Apostles, the ancient true Tradi-
 tion could not *but change and faile* also, there-
 fore at this day Tradition is worthless
 and unvaluable, because no man can
 know upon any sure Principle, what it
 anciently was.

29 The Dr may reply. All called Christians own the *Bible* and the Miracles there related of Christ and his Apostles, which are sufficient to prove Christs Doctrine true, so far at least Tradition never failed. Small Comfort, God knowes, to have Tradition of the Scriptures *bare letter* (which yet is not had in our Sectaries Principles. *See Reas: and Relig: Disc. 1. c. 6. n. 2.*) If the Christian world long since, cheated out of their ancient Faith, bequeathed to posterity a false Doctrine in *Lieu* of that which Christ and his Apostles taught, and with that, a false Tradition also. Moreover, were those Miracles with their Tradition proved most true, the *Arians* will as well lay claim to them for a proof their Doctrine, as the Dr can do for that Religion he professes, and the like may all others pretend (*if called Christians*) though of a quite different belief in the very *Essentials of Faith*, unless this consequence utterly false be good. Christ our Lord wrought such and such Miracles, *Ergo*, *Protestancy* is a better Religion *then Arianism*, *Pelagianism* is better *then Nestorianism*; and so of the rest. The Dr therefore must either make this out, that Christ and his Apostles wrought their Miracles to confirm all the erroneous Sects in the

The Arians and all heresicks lay as great claims to Christs Miracles, as the Dr or any other doth.

the world, or he speaks nothing to the purpose, when he tells us in his *Account*. ^{What the Dr is obliged} P. 205. *That the Motives of Faith both to us clear ?* them (the ancient Christians) and to us, are the same, only the manner of conveyance is different, those Primitive Believers saw them, we hear of them by Tradition. In saying this he either thinks, that such Motives prove the truth of all Religions called *Christian*, which is horridly false, or only prove the true Christian Religion among so many dissenting Sects. Grant this, and we are in as much darkness after the *supposed Truth* of these Miracles and the Dr's long discourse; as we were before, and can never know by his *Motives only*, which is the true Religion. I earnestly desire the Dr would please to solve this one difficulty, which I judge cannot be Solved.

30 By all hitherto clearly laid down, we see, 1. The Dr's rational Evidence so much talked of, brought to nothing but empty words, for his whole proofs are meer unproved Suppositions. He endeavours to evince by Miracles *internal to Scripture*, the Divinity of the book, which is to say, one part of Scripture proves another, before the whole book is proved upon any certain Authority to be God's Word, or written by the Holy Ghost. From hence,

*The necessity
of an Infallible Church,
evinced from
our discourse.*

hence: 2. the necessity of an Infallible *evincend Church* is necessarily inferred, which only bring's us out of the Labyrinth wherein the Dr is lost. This Church as I said, proves by her *infallible* and never interrupted Tradition, that Scripture is God's word; She, and She only, ascertain's all, that the Contents in Scripture are Divinely inspired, (and finally when difficulties arise concerning the Sence in controverted passages, relating to Necessaries, composes all strifes (otherwise endless) and bring's all to a perfect unity in Faith.

*Not one
Protestant
Tener proved
by Scripture.*

31 I say lastly. Could the Dr evince, that the book of Scripture contain's true Doctrin, could he shew the Doctrin of it to be, as it truly is, *Divinely inspired*, he yet hath not one clear Sentence in the whole Bible (understood according to the obvious sence of the words) which proves so much as one Tene of Protestant Religion, as Protestancy is distinguished from Popery, and the Doctrin of all known condemned Hereticks. The proof of this Assertion is largely laid forth. *Reas. and Relig: Disc: 1. c. 20. from n. 4.* to the end of that Chapter, and because I really judge Protestancy utterly ruined upon *the reasons* there alleged, I petition Dr Still: to review that short Discourse,

Discourse, and if I judge amiss, to unbecome me by a plain Answer, showing wherein my Arguments are fallacious.

32 I except in that place against his empty Title, called *A rational Account of the grounds of Protestants Religion*, and prove as I think demonstratively, that if you cast out of Protestancy all it's *Negative Articles*, which the Dr confesses are no *Essentials*, the remainder will either be what the Catholick Church teaches, and therefore not *peculiar to Protestancy*, or the Doctrin of some one or other condemned Heretick: In so much, that in the whole *Essence of Protestancy*, you will not find one Truth revealed by Almighty God, *necessary for Salvation*, or ever Nor one Necessary for Salva- tion found in Prote- taught by any Orthodox Church. And herein it differ's not only from Catholick Religion, but, as I take it, from all ancient Heresies, for both *Arians* and *Pelagians* (the like is of the rest) thought their particular Doctrins *revealed by Almighty God*, and necessary to Salvation, Otherwise they had been worse than besotted, to abandon the Catholick Tenents for opinions meerly, or Positions not necessary to Salvation. See more of this subiect. *Disc. 3. c. 18. n. 8.*

CHAP. X.

The Church proved Infallible before She interpret's Scripture. The reason hereof. The Doctors gross error in charging à Circle on us, in the Resolution of Faith. VVhat à vicious Circle implies, and how it differ's from à rational Regress in Discourse.

1 **T**He rest that followes in the Dr from. P. 423. is all along meer *Confusion*, or à horrid jumbling in à speculative matter concerning the resolution of Faith, and *the notion of à vicious Circle*, which he truly understand's not, but wonder nothing, you can expect no better from halfe Scholars in speculative learning, if I make not what I here assert manifest, blame me boldly.

2 To rescue my Doctrin from Blunders, (and the Dr, if I ever met with any, is one) I am forced to set down plainly part of it, That done, you shall se how remote the Dr is from meddling with it. The most he would except against, you have at large. *Reas: and Relig.*

Relig. Disc. 3. c. 5. n. 5. where I answer an Objection proposed in his *Account*, P. 127. And assert. Seing Scripture evidences not it selfe to be *divinely inspired*, some other Infallible Oracle, distinct from Scripture, necessarily ascertain's that *Truth*, and this is the Church, which as rationally proves herselfe by Signs and Miracles an Oracle whereby God speaks *independently of Scripture*, as ever any Apostle proved himself to be so, before Scripture was written. Hence I inferred, that the Church was ever, and is yet *in à General way* believed infallible by *Her self*, and *for Her self*, upon this ground, that God speaks by Her *as his own Oracle*, and then concluded, that She is not in the *first place* proved infallible by Scripture. I say in à *General way*, for thus the Apostles believed our Saviour to be the true Messias, before they received from him à full Account of many other particular Christian Verities, learned after that *General acknowledgement*.

*The Church
not first pro-
ved Infalli-
ble by Scrip-
ture*

3 Thus much and more, amply declared in the place now cited, comes Dr Still: in his last book. P. 424. with his old Tautologies, and asks again, as if nothing *had been said*, why we believe the Churches Infallibility, and verily think's,

we

we have no other way to make out Her Infallibility, *but only by Scripture*? Is not this worse then jumbling? Reflect good Reader. I shew that the Church in the first place is proved infallible without recourse at all had to Scripture (for so She was proved infallible before Scriptures were written) and here he out-faces me with empty words, saying I cannot prove the Church infallible but *by Scripture only*? In lieu of this ridiculous Reply. He should have refuted my reasons, and this is one. No man can ascertain any that Scripture is *divinely inspired*, or render the true sense of it relating to *Necessaries* for Salvation, but one only infallible Church. Therefore the Church which only can give certainty of these truths, must necessarily be first owned infallible before we recur to Scripture, for it is more than Senseless to prove by Scripture the Churches *Infallibility*, or any other Article of *Christian Faith*, before we have absolute Assurance that the *Book whereby we argue is Gods word*, and know what its meaning is in a hundred difficult passages, But thus much is only known by Church Authority, as is amply proved in the place now cited.

It is Senseless to prove the Church by Scripture, before Scripture be Proved Gods word.

4 This reason the Dr shamefully waves

waves with à jeer, and tell's me. P. 405. that this first act of Faith terminated upon Church Authority hath nothing to rely on but the *fallible Motives of Credibility*, and Consequently cannot be *Divine Faith* for want of an *Infallible Testimony*. Gross ignorance produced this Answer, for have not I proved through my whole last Treatise, that God as immediately speak's to us now by his Church, as ever he did by Prophet, or Apostle? And if God speak by it, there is no want of an *Infallible Testimony*. I challenge the D^r to answer my Arguments upon this subject hitherto never taken notice of, neither shall he hereafter reply without apparent shuffling (to use his words) and running away from the main difficulty, here treated. How often have I told him that Divine Faith relies not upon the Motives of Credibility (though these as inducements lead to it) but upon *God's speaking by the Church*, as is now declared?

5 Having thus cleared the first act of Faith from all danger of a Circle, because it ultimately rest's upon *God's speaking by the Church*, made by *itself* immediately credible without recourse to Scripture, yet not known so he *Divine* or *God's*

evidenced
null, and
forecasts,

God's infallible word. I add moreover, N, 9. If we speak of *another distinct, consequent, and more explicit act of Faith*, whereby we believe the Churches *Infallibility*, when this Oracle declares the Scriptures true Sence which proves her Infallible, *there is no difficulty at all*, because this interpretation of Scripture brought to its last Principle, is ultimately resolved into, and therefore again believed upon Scripture and the Churches Infallible exposition together; for thus jointly taken, they ground Faith and not like two *disparate Principles*, as if we first believed the Scriptures sence independently of the Churches interpretation, and then again believed the Churches exposition to be infallible because the sence of Scripture, (known without any dependence on Church Authority) saith She is Infallible. Our good Dr let's down these words more at large, and desires the Reader to try his faculty upon them, *What tolerable sence he can make of them?* I answer, more learned faculties in *Speculative matters* than the Doctor's is, have made sence of them, and that's enough to ward off his weak blow of contempt. Now I am to discover his fallacious, and more then simple way of Arguing against me.

6 The whole difficulty is brought at last to the true decision of this Question.
Whether

Whether one Infallible Oracle, while it explicates the darker Sence of another likewise Infallible, cannot be believed for *itself* without à vicious Circle? One or two Instances will clear my meaning. The Prophet *Joel*. 2. 28. long before *S. Peter* lived, Prophesied of the effusion of God's divine Spirit upon all flesh, which words dark in themselves, that great Apostle *Acts*. 2. 16. interpret's as spoken of the pouring out of Gods Spirit upon the Apostles in the feast of Pentecost. *This is that*, saith *S. Peter*, *which was said, or foretold by the Prophet Joel*. Observe well. *S. Peter* was proved an Infallible Oracle before he interpreted this Passage of an Infallible Prophet, so is the Church proved Infallible before She interpret's any words in Scripture. *S. Peter* used or exercised his Power of interpreting *infallibly*, not first proved *infallible* by his *Interpretation*, but upon other grounds, wholly independent of that Sence he gives to the Prophet; So is the Church first proved infallible independently of all, and every Interpretation She gives of Scripture. Finally, as that darker Sence of the Prophet, made clear by the Apostles Infallible Interpretation, indivisibly concurred to the Faith of the

The difficulty concerning à vicious Circle, proposed.

Q

Primitive

242 Part. I. c. 10. Of à vicious Circle,
Primitive Christians, so also the darker
Sence of Scripture cleared by the Chur-
ches interpretation, *indivisibly* concur's to
the Faith of Believers now.

An Instance
worth re-
flection,

The use of
the Chur-
ches power
destroys not
her power.

7 Ponder well the force of this In-
stance, and you will soon se through the
Dr's trivial Obiections. I say in à word.
Had S. Peter proved himself in the first
place Infalible by the Sence of that
Scripture he then interpreted, the Circle
would have been Manifest, *because the
thing proved, which is the infalible explication
of Joel, is assumed again or first made use of,
to prove S. Peter and his explication
infalible.* But when the Apostles In-
fallibility in every Doctrin of Faith, stood
firm upon *other grounds*, though he had
never written Scripture, nor interpreted
any Prophet, that man must be quicker
sighted than Aristotle who find's à Circle
in it. This is our case as to the Church.
She is, in à general way supposed and
proved infalible in every Catholick
Doctrin, independently of this or that
particular taught by her, one particular is
the true Interpretation of Scripture (more
rightly called the exercise and use of
her infalible Assistance then the proof
of it) but evinces not herselfe in the first
place to be infalible, *because She inter-
pret's for that is antecedently proved
upon other grounds, therefore unless she*

use

use of Her power wherewith She is indued to interpret infallibly, *destroy that power*, it is impossible to catch her in à Circle, while she interpret's.

8 Thus much premised. You shall see the Dr's Obiection melt like wax before the fire. Judge Reader, saith he. P. *The Dr's own words.* 428 *whether here be not à plain Circle. Because they believe the Church infallible, because the true sence of Scripture saith she is so, and again they believe, this to be the infallible sence of Scripture, because the infallible Church saith so.* Judge Reader, say I, whether one plain distinction overthrowes not this feeble fallacy, and thus it is. We first believe the Church infallible, because the true Sence of Scripture *saith she is infallible*, I deny it; for that first act of Faith is not at all founded on Scripture: We believe the Church infallible by à second *more distinct and explicit Faith, indivisibly fixed on Scripture and the Churches Interpretation together*, I grant that most willingly. Now this second act of Faith must, if we make à right *Analysis*, be at last resolved into this other *general Truth*. *What ever God speak's by the Church is certain and infallible*, which general Truth stand's firm without recourse to Scripture at all. The reason is. Whatever Argument proved

Q² the

the Church God's infallible Oracle in all She taught, before Scripture was written, proves Her also without depending on *Scripture*, the same Infallible Oracle still.

9 The other part following in the Dr's discourse, is wholly as lame. *We believe again, this to be the Infallible Sence of Scripture because the Infallible Church saith so.* I answer we believe so indeed, but by à second more *explicit act of Faith*, which supposes the Church proved infallible *antecedently* to her Interpretation, where there is no shadow of à Circle, for if the Church be owned infallible in every matter of Christian Faith, thus much only followes, that when She interprets, the same God that once spake *obscurely in Scripture*, declares his meaning *more clearly* by his own Oracle, the Church.

10 One example where you shall have the Dr's circle as round as à hoop, will yet give more light. Imagin those words of the Apostle 1. Tim. 3. 15. *The Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth*, to be, as Sectaries will have them, obscure, or not openly significant for the Churches Infallibility. Suppose again, that *S. Paul*, or any other infallible Apostle had delivered in clearer terms the true Sence of them; nay, suppose, he had told us the true meaning of those words. *The*

Pillar

The Dr's
absurd fal-
lacy, unra-
velled.

Pillar and ground of truth, is just so as Catholicks now believe. Could Mr Dr, or any man living have found à vicious Circle here, had *S. Paul* been owned and proved an *Infallible Teacher*, independently of his clearer interpretation. It is impossible, while we believe *S. Paul* speaking obscurely, for *S. Paul* delivering the Sence of his own words more clearly.

11 Now, Sr, look upon your own pretty Circle. *We* believe, say you ^{the D's Circle restor-} *the Church to be infallible, because the true sence of* ^{ted upon} *Scripture saith so.* And you believe ^{himselfe.} *the Church to be the pillar and ground of truth*, because the true sence of *S. Paul's* words explicated by *Apostolical Authority*, saith so. Moreover Say you, *We* believe this to be the *Infallible Sence of Scripture* because *the Infallible Church saith so*, and could not you, Sr, have believed such à Sence of the words now cited, had *S. Paul* delivered it, because either he, or some other infallible Apostle, said so? This is only to assert in plainer Terms, that the darker sence written in Scripture by one Infallible Oracle, can be cleared by the Interpretation of the *very same*, or any other *Infallible Oracle*, which lead's no man into the least danger of à vicious Circle.

12 Pray tell me, Mr Dr, when you

Q 3

in

in your *Account* interpret our Saviours words. *This is my body* : according to the Sence you judge true, do you intangle your Reader in a vicious Circle ? By your new way of Arguing it's plain you do : *For those who read or hear your interpretation assent to it as true, because the true Sence of Scripture, saith so : And again they believe this to be the true Sence of Scripture, because you say so.* Your Interpretation has some influence upon the assent of those that believe it, (be it *Condition, Cause*, or what you will) otherwise it signifies nothing , but stand's like an useless cypher in your book. This granted , your Circle is manifestly vicious, for you run in a round from your *supposed true interpretation* of Scripture , to the true *Sence of Scripture*, and back again, *from the true Sence of Scripture to your supposed true Interpretation.* Mark well. Your Interpretation is proved or believed true by the *true sence* of Scripture, (here is your only ground) and the true Sence of Scripture, is again proved or believed true by your *supposed true explication*. Hence it follows , that either your interpretation is not according to the true Sence of Scripture (God forbid say you) or that the true Sence of Scripture, correspond's not to your *supposed true explication*, or finally this must be granted, that you run round in a Circle, and prove the one by the other

Perhaps

And yet
made more
Clear.

13 Perhaps to avoid à Circle it will be said, you prove not your Interpretation true by the *true sence of Scripture* but evince that upon other grounds distinct from Scripture, Viz. by the Authority of Fathers, your often alleged *sence and reason*, and God knowes what. Is it so indeed? Dare you, Sr, most shamefully quit the only main prop you rely on, *which is Scripture*, when you stand most in need of it (whereof more presently) and yet charge on me à vicious Circle, while I believe the true Sence of Scripture because an infallible Church *declares that Sence*? Cannot I more rationally, would I seek Subterfugies, evince the Infallibility of the Church by other proofs, drawn from *Fathers, Church authority, and reason*, and plead as you do to avoid à Circle, were it necessary? But I like no such Shuffling. I positively assert, the Sence of Scripture is therefore proved and believed true, because the *Infallible Church* saith so, though if questioned further, I must bring in my reason why I believe this Oracle Infallible, yet the immediate ground of my belief is the *Churches Interpretation*, given upon Christs words now cited, and I rest upon her Authority by Faith, though this Interpretation be not the first ground, why I believe her *Infallible*, but that other more *general received*.

Truth

348 Part. 1. c. 10. *Of a vicious Circle,*
Truth, that proves Her Gods own Oracle
in all she delivers as matter of Faith,
which general Truth (observe it well) is
most rationally evinced without any re-
course to, or dependance on Scripture. And
this is only to say that a Divine Oracle
first proved Infallible, can interpret Scrip-
ture without danger of a vicious Circle.

14 What I here assert is undeniable,
for had any Apostle explained those
words in the Gospel. *I and my Father are*
one, answerable to the Sence now belie-
ved in the Church. Viz. *That Christ*
our Lord is the eternal Son of God, consubstan-
tial with his Father, could not the pri-
mitive Christians have as firmly fixed
their believe upon those words, *Infallibly*
interpreted, as the Disciples fixed their
Believe upon our Saviours Interpretation,
when *Luke. 8. 9.* he fully explai-
ned the Sence of that Parable concer-
ning the *sower and Seed*? These and the
like Interpretations are believeable
matters of Faith upon this Principle, that
every Interpreter (whether Christ or
Apostle) was supposed and proved Infal-
lible independently of that Sence they
gave to God's sacred words, and so is
the Church, as is already declared.

15 The D^r's Confusion and whole
mistake lies here, that he has not yet got
perfectly into his head the *right notion* of

à vicious Circle, and therefore P. 428. wishes I had told him *the Secret*, I will do it briefly, and then make his error more known.

16 A vicious Circle, Mr Dr, ever implies *two Propositions*, or in à Circular discourse, *two Syllogisms*. Here we will insist upon Propositions, being more plain and easy, then to proceed by long Syllogisms. Know therefore, when any first Proposition is assumed to prove the second, and this second is made use of, without further light, to prove the first again, or that very thing which is asserted by the first, the Circle is notoriously vicious. For example. One endeavours to prove man to have *Free-will*, because he is indowed with an *intellectual Faculty*, then return's again, and proves him *intellectual*, because he hath *Free-will*; the second Proposition implies à Circle, because the thing proved, which is *Liberty* or *Free will*, not otherwise evinced but by *mans being intellectual*, is made use of to prove that Power, and so in effect *Liberty* or *Free-will*, becomes à *Medium* to prove it self by.

17 Observe well. This vicious consequence whereby man seem's evinced à free Agent or indowed with liberty, takes all the force it hath from the Antecedent of his being *intellectual*, and wholly

What à
Vicious Cir-
cle implies I

250 Part. 1. c. 10. Of à vicious Circle,
 wholly relies on that *Medium*. If there-
 fore (as it here fall's out) that Conse-
 quence *whereby Liberty is asserted, without*
any more light, or further proof, be again
 assumed as the only *Medium* to prove
 man intellectual; Liberty or Free-will
 by its proving man intellectual, *proves*
it self, and thus, *hic & nunc*, is both
Antecedent, and *Consequent*; *Antecedent*, as it
 is the *Medium* to prove man *Intellectual*,
 and *Consequent*, as it is the thing proved
 by Intellectuality, which flaw is ever ma-
 nifest in all vicious Circles, as *Aristotle*
 notes well. *Lib. 1. Post. cap. 3.*

18 Now on the other side, should I
 take this Consequence concerning Liber-
 ty, which is deduced from the Antece-
 dent of mans being intellectual; Should
 I prove that Consequence upon other
 grounds, either by Authority, or manifest
 experience, because we se men freely
 eschew Evil and embrace Good; should
 I from thence inferr that he is *Intellectual*,
 the Inference now guarded, by other
 proofs, barely *subsist's not upon the strength* of
 its *Antecedent*, but is à Verity known *aliunde*
 and therefore is rightly called, *Regressus*
utilis, à rational, *profitable Regress*, free from
 all vicious Circulation. For as Philoso-
 phers teach, grounding their discourse
 vpon *Aristotle* now cited, A vicious
 Circle is à *Regress* or going back, *ab eodem*

The differen-
 ce between
 a Circle,
 and à profit-
 able way of
 Arguing.

ad Idem, & per eandem viam, from the same thing to the same again, and by the same way, as appears in the Instance proposed, where the Antecedent assuming *Intellectual*, proves *Liberty*, and *Liberty* not known, as I said, upon any other proof but by that *Medium, Intellectual*, return's again and by the very same way, proves *Intellectuallity*. This is to say, the Consequence as known by the Antecedent, offer's to prove at once *both it self*, and the *Antecedent together*. Had Dr St: well reflected upon what is here noted, he might easily have spared his lost labour spent upon a vicious Circle, and it is a wonder he wanted reflection, because *Sextus Empiricus* cited by him in the short discourse he has of that he calls a *Diallel* gives every one light enough to see what the Dr, it seems, saw not, though *Sextus* be none of the clearest Authors.

19 Thus much premised, we proceed to the matter now in hand, and Assert. If any one should in the first place, either believe or prove the Sence of Scripture, to be true by the Churches Interpretation, (not otherwise believed *Infallible* or proved true but barely by her Interpretation) and should again goe about to prove her Interpretation true, by nothing but her own Interpretation, which explains that true Sence; the Circle would be
manifest

An applica-
tion made to
the matter
now in hand.

manifest, because the *true Sence of Scripture interpreted by the Church*, is again assumed as the *only Medium to prove her Interpretation true*: which way of Arguing, essentially implies à vicious Regress, *from the very same thing to the same thing again, and by the very same way*. But, if I first prove the Churches Infallibility in *all She teaches upon other Grounds* without any recourse at all, either to the words or Sence of Scripture (as is shewed above) and from thence both prove and believe her Interpretation to be infallibly true, that man who holds this way of Arguing Circular, knowes no more what à Circle is than Doctor Stillingfleet. A little touch upon the Dr's weak Obiections, will yet give more clarity.

The Dr's
Obiections
answered

20 *Is not that à Circle, saith he, P. 428. When the Argument made use to prove another thing by, must it self be proved by that very thing which it is made use of to prove?* Very good, Sr, these general Terms hurt nobody; to your Application therefore in the next page. *The thing to be proved, Say you, is the Churches Infallibility, the Argument to prove it by, is the Infallible Sence of Scripture.* Answ. I flatly deny, the first proof of the Churches Infallibility, to be the *Infallible Sence of Scripture*, for the first Argument is taken from that general
Truth

Truth, whereby She is owned and proved God's Infallible Oracle in every thing She teaches concerning Faith; and this independently of Scripture. Here I say more. It is impossible to prove her *first* Infallible by the Sence she gives of Scripture, because that Sence is not known before She interpret's, and no body goes about to prove any thing by meer insignificant Characters, without their Sence. Can the Dr who hold's the Church Fallible, and must if he ever *evince* that prove it by Scripture, probably take his Proof from *Scripture not senced*? It is plain Dotage to do so. He goes on. *But if the Infallible Sence of Scripture can be proved by nothing but by the Churches infallible Interpretation, then it is plain that is assumed as an Argument to prove infallibility by, which cannot be otherwise known, than by this Infallibility.* What Infallibility doth the Dr speak of in these last ambiguous words? If he say, we prove the Infallible Sence of Scripture by the *Churches infallible Interpretation*, I grant it. If contrarywise, he thinks we prove in the *first place* the Churches Infallibility by her own infallible Interpretation of Scripture, he err's grossly, as is already made manifest, and therefore proves nothing.

*To argue
from Scrip-
ture not
Senced, is
Non-sense.*

21 In à word either the Sence of Scripture is known by the Churches Interpretation, or is clear by it self. If known upon the Churches Interpretation, the Sence is one and the same with that of the Scripture, for these two Oracles can never clash, or differ. If known by it selfe, as it is in many Passages relating to manners, no more is required. but that the Church ascertain us of the Scriptures *Divine Inspiration*; So that still we depend upon the Church; alwaies for the *assurance of Scripture* being Divine, or from God, and in the greatest Mysteries of Faith we rely on it also, for *the true Sence*.

22 A second objection. *It is à little strange, that there should be no difficulty at all in believing the Churches Infallibility upon the Sence of those Scriptures, whose Sence could not infallibly be known without the Supposal of that Infalibility which is proved by them.* Answ. Its more than à little strange, that the Dr cannot distinguish between the first general act of Faith whereby the Church is believed Infalible (without depending on Scripture) and à second *more explicit* and Consequent act, which wholly relies upon Her interpretation and Scripture together. It is also strange, if God pleases to speak *obscurly*, as he certainly doth, in many Passages

sages of *Holy Writ*, that another Infallible Oracle cannot tell us ^{what} *with he mean's, without* à vicious Circle. The Substance of all he objects here, only amount's to thus much. We prove or believe the Churches Infallibility upon the Sence of those Scriptures, whose sence cannot be infallibly known without the supposal of that Infallibility. If he mean's (as he must) *by supposal*, and that *Infallibility*, the Churches Infallibility, I have answered, the Church is not only *supposed* but *proved* also infallible before Scripture was written, and before She ever went about to interpret that Divine Book.

23 A third Obiection is the like Tautologic over again, and therefore requires no other, but the same Solution. *If* saith he, *the Infallible sence of Scripture be resolved into, and believed upon the same infallible Authority of the Church, then I still enquire how this infallible Authority of the Church comes to be proved by this exposition of Scripture, the Infallibility of which, doth suppose the thing to be proved. Viz. the Churches Infallibility?* To what purpose Should we lose time? Have not I answered, *that the Churches Infallibility* stand's firm upon other grounds before Scripture be either *owned Divine*, or the Sence of its difficult passages can be known? Have not I moreover said, *that, that general Truth of the Churches*

Infall-

Two Strange Mistakes in the Dr.

Infallibility must necessarily be proved
 and supposed *antecedently* to the belief of
 this or that particular Interpretation?
 For who can fix his Faith upon the expo-
 sition of any Divine Oracle, *without being*
first ascertained, it is God, that speak's by it?
 The Instances given above, most clear-
 ly evince, what is here asserted. Please
 to make use either of our Saviours inter-
 preting his own Parable. *Luke 8.* concer-
 ning the *Sower and seed*, or of S. Peters
 exposition given to the Prophet Joel.
 They are one and the same in order to
 my present Intent. We prove or believe
 that to be the true Sence of our Saviours
 Parable, because eternal Truth inter-
 preted it so, but do we again first prove
 or believe him to be *eternal Truth*, becau-
 se he then delivered *the true Sence* of that
 Parable to his Disciples? No. For by
 this lame way of arguing we should
 prove, the Sence of the Parable *to be true*
 upon our Saviour Interpretation, and
 again prove him a true *Interpreter*, be-
 cause *he interpreted*. Mark well the Dr's
 confusion. We Catholicks saith he, be-
 lieve *the Church to be infallible because the true*
Sence of Scripture saith she is so. And you,
 Sr, believe our Saviours Interpretation
 upon that Parable *to be true* (that Para-
 ble is now Scripture) because our Saviour
 inter-

The Dr's
 Confused
 Doctrin,
 Clearly dri-
 ven back
 upon him-
 selfe.

interpreted it so. Again. *we believe this to be the Infallible sence of Scripture because the Infallible Church saith so.* And you, Mr Dr, believe this to be the Infallible Sence of that Parable, *because Christ, said so.* Here, Sr, you have your own Circle in express Terms. Judge whether it stand's not something awry. What must be done then to get out of this Confusion? All must answer. Though we believe our Saviours Interpretation by an Infallible act of Faith, yet we first prove him not infallible *because he interprets*, but suppose his *Infallibility made out* and proved upon other grounds, *independently of his explication.* And this is our Answer also as to the Church, whereof enough is said already, and more than ever the Dr will, or can Answer.

24 P. 430. the Doctor once more run's on with the same Tautologie, and because I said, *the Scripture and Churches interpretation indivisibly Concur so that latter act of Faith whereby we believe the Sence of Scripture explained by the Church,* he tells me, *This indivisible concurrence Seem's to him an odd piece of Mystical Divinity.* I Answer no great matter for that, *as odd as it is*, he must own it, if he believes S. Peters infallible Interpretation upon the *Prophet*, or the exposition

R

given

His Tautologies and ill words.

258 Part. 1. c. 10. Of à vicious Circle,
given to the Royal Prophets *Testimony*.
Psal. 131. 11. Foreseeing, saith the Apostle,
he spake of *Christs Resurrection. Acts. 2.*
31. Semore of this indivisible concurrence,
Reas: and Relig: Disc: 3. c. 11. n.
10. The rest our Dr hath to his page
433. is either the like Tautologie. *Ve*
prove the Churches Infallibility by the Infalli-
ble Sence of Scripture, and the infallible Sence
of Scripture by the Churches Infallibility; Or
most uncivil language, or finally, à foul
ending with à gross mistake, for he
thinks our Faith rest's upon no *Infallible*
Authority, because we have none to rely
on, but Motives Confessedly fallible. It
is à perverse errour already refuted.

25 To end this Controversy about à
vicious Circle, wherein the Dr. P. 431.
account's me à *Conjurer*, and one that
speaks things which neither he, nor any one
els can understand, I have right, methinks
to enquire by what means, or upon what
grounded Motive can the Dr come to à
certainty of the Scriptures true Sence? In
proposing this Question I might easily
retaliate, and tell him: Though he
Conjure, cheat, and shuffle his whole life
long, he shall never yet clear this one
difficulty without recourse to an *Infalli-*
ble Church. The proof of my *Asser-*
tion stand's sure upon this most un-
doubted

doubted principle. *The true Sence of A dissenting Scripture in many passages* (relating to ^{proposed and} *Necessaries for Salvation*) is no *Selfe*. ^{the Dr is} *evidence*, nor can it be certainly known ^{desired to} *Answer.* by that endless Search, or *mispent industry* of private men, as appear's by those many most opposit, and plain contradictory Interpretations which the learned of different Religions give to these and the like Expressions in God's word. *I and my Father are one. The word is made flesh. There are three that give Testimony in Heaven &c.* Nor one of these Passages, though pondered and compared with other Texts in Holy Writ, doth *evidence its own true Sence*, Therefore the means whereby it is discovered, or the Oracle which infallibly ascertain's it, must necessarily be both distinct from the dark words, now cited, and also more *clear, and plainly significant*, than the yet concealed Sence is, we seek for. Now further. Neither *Calvins private Spirit*, nor the *Dr's rational Evidence*, nor *Tradition without*, nor *Grace within* (as Bishop Lawd speaks in the *Dr's Account* *P. 186. n. 15*) nor finally any other *Medium* (which is not Scripture) can infallibly declare this Sence, as is largely proved both in this Treatise, and the last. Therefore an *Infallible Church* must either do God and

man this good Service, and certainly tell us, what Scripture Speak's in these Necessaries for Salvation; Or the true meaning of God's Word, will be just like Some useles airy nicity (not worth knowing) still matter of debate ever disputable, but never known. Thus much said in answer to the Dr's Speculative part, we passe in the next Discourse to à serious view of his long Drollery, and simple exceptions made against the glorious Miracles wrought in the Roman Catholick Church, and Shall God willing evince, that in this Treatise where he thought to triumph most, he is foiled, and hath disgraced none, but himselfe.

An end of the first Part.

A DIS-

A DISCOURSE,

CONCERNING MIRACLES WROUGHT

in the Roman

CATHOLICK CHVRCH,

*in vindication of their Truth against
Doctor Stillingfleets unjust Cavils.*

VV H E R E,

The Miraculous Translation of
the Holy Hoste

O F

L O R E T O

*is Asserted, and proved, an undeniable
Verity.*

BY E. W.

The second Part.

A N T W E R P,

Printed by MICHAEL CNOBBAERT;
at the Sign of. S. Peter in the Year. 1674.

D^r Stillingfleet in his second Dis-
course. Chap. 3. P. 434, makes
an Enquiry into the Miracles of the
Roman Church: I follow him as he goes
along, and lay open the ill Success our
Inquisitive man hath had in his Search,
which will, I hope, appear to every
one, after a full view taken of what
is proposed in the ensuing Treatise.
Peruse, and judge Courteous Reader.

C H A P. I.

How I formerly argued in behalfe of our Churches Miracles. The Dr in his Enquiry waves my Arguments. Of the difference between Christ's Miracles, and those wrought by the Apostles, and in the Church. What is meant by Church Miracles. Of the Cheats which run through the Drs whole Enquiry.

1. **T**Hough little might Suffice to refute the Dr's strange, rambling, and unprincipled Discourse; yet because the weightiness of this matter concerning Miracles, worthily deserves a larger Examination, we shall, God willing, bestow more pains upon it, in another small distinct *Treatise*; in this, we chiefly insist upon plain matters of fact. Now if you desire to know how I argued against the Dr for the truth of our Church Miracles. *Reason and Religion*. Disc: 2. C. 7. 8. you Shall have it very briefly.

2. I first urged C. 7. n. 7. our Saviours Miracles own Prophecy. Iohn. 14. 12. I say unto you, *in the Church for,* *told by our* *Saviour.* *He that believes in me, the Works which I do, he shall do, and greater Works then these shall be do.* which Truth, even Calvin and other Sectaries

upon this Passage (far more rational than the Dr) apply not to the Apostles only , nor to every believing Christian, but assert it belongs to the whole Body of the Church. This Prophecy without doubt contained à truth, and we see it with our eyes evidently fulfilled, not only in the Conversion of whole Nations to Christ, justly accounted *Miraculous* by S. Austin (far more in number then those our Saviour Converted) but also, in other Signal wonders wrought by God's Servants in this only Catholick Church.

Our Saviours Singular prerogative in working Miracles.

3 To this Authority , frequently urged by Catholick Authors, our Dr answer's nothing, but as his manner is quarrel's, because I parallel Church Miracles and our Saviours together, and seem's to think I difference them not at all, though I with every one most willingly grant, that *Christ Iesus* shewed himself, the greatest *Thaumaturgus* the world yet beheld , and far surpassed all Angels and men, whether *Patriarchs, Prophets, or Apostles* , in working Miracles. His singular Prerogative first appeared in this (so Faith teaches) *that the Wonders he Drought were done by his own Power and Virtue* , as S. Cyril upon the. 6. of *Luke* ponder's , without borrowing assistance from any power above him, for as God, he had no Superiour ; wherefore calling the Disciples together. *Matt: 10.* He impowred them, powerless of themselves, to do wonders, to cast out Divels and cure the infirm. 2. As S. Thomas notes. 22. *Quest 178. a. 1.* The Grace of working Miracles was no Constant and permanent Gift imparted to any, save only to our Saviour , who by virtue of his Hypo-

statical

statical union could doe wonders, when and as often as he pleased. A third singular Prerogative peculiar to Christ, arose from his being *Lord of the whole world*, and therefore wrought wonders all Nature over. As supreme Master, he commanded a new Star to shine over him at his birth, and at his death darkned the lights of Heaven, with a word of his mouth he made the figtree barren, and commanded the winds and sea to obey him. In his Sacred Passion he split the rocks, rent the vaile of the Temple, moved the earth, as if all nature had trembled, to behold the God of Nature dye.

4. Observe now I beseech you, when we say Church Miracles answer in number and worth to those of our Saviour, we are far from ascribing the singular Prerogatives already mentioned to either man or Angel, save only to the Word Incarnate. Neither goe we about to perswade, that the Miracles which Christ wrought and rationally proved, he was one immediatly sent from God to redeem the world, *John 11. 42*, were ever done in the like manner, or Circumstances by any. For as he was first in *Power* and *Excellence*, so also he shewed himself the first most Victorious Conquerour over Sin and infidelity, vanquishing by his glorious wonders without violent hands, *Judaism* and *Gentilism*. Again, herein he hath preeminence above Mortals, that all the Miracles wrought by his Servants, whether Apostles or others, may be rightly cal-

These prerogatives more particularly Specified.

called Christ's Miracles, not only because done in his Name, but upon this account also, that they are wrought by his Power. For if as S. Austin teaches, when one Baptizes Christ also Baptizes with him, upon the same reason we may justly say, when a Miracle is wrought by a holy Person, Christ our Lord by the Power and virtue he gives, works it with him, and therefore is not only the most powerful Thaumaturgus, but effectually shewes it in concurring with all, that do these wonders.

5. Notwithstanding, to verify the Prediction of greater Wonders, we say, That far more, and of the like quality with those of our Saviours, have for the good of mankind, temporal and spiritual, been wrought in the Church, which is evident: For more blinde have seen, more lame have walked, more deaf heard, more dead have risen again, more poor have received the Gospel in the latter Ages of the Church, than before, when Christ and his Apostles preached; These mentioned in the Gospel. *Matth: II. 4.* I insisted upon, and are without dispute greater in the Church, witness that one Miracle of Nations receiving the Gospel. Neither can the Dr gain-say my Assertion, but by denying all humane Faith and plain matters of fact, recorded by such as have written largely of this subject. One of the last Authors is the Erudite *Silvester Petra Sancta*, in his two learned Tomes called, *Thaumasia vera Religionis*. Printed Anno 1643 and 1646. where the Miracles

Our Assertion of greater wonders, proved

Conversion of Nations, greater,

Part 2. c. 1. Of Church Miracles , 7
cles of the old and new Testament are parallel, and the Churches continued Miracles, most amply set down with their undeniable Proofs. But of this subject more hereafter. Now to my second Argument.

6 I argued. 2. n. 9. If Miracles, Gods *The Necessary*
own Seals and Characters, were at the first *ty of Miracles, laid*
preaching of the Gospel rational and necessary Inducements for men to believe *forth.*
Christ's Doctrine, as also to distinguish the
Orthodox Church from the Conventicles of
Jews and Hereticks, There is the like necessity of their Continuance in after Ages.
The reason hereof is thus given. n. 11.
The Conversion of Infidels to Christ was not wrought by the Apostles only, *or all at once*, but successively in the ensuing Ages, when other Infidels rose up as barbarous, as uncivilized, and Ignorant of Christ's Doctrine as the former converted by the Apostles had been, if therefore Miracles were wholly Necessary, when those first blessed men preached, How come they now to be unnecessary, when these latter Infidels are preach't to, and gain'd to Christ? These never made so happy a change because they heard Truths *barly taught*, but were convinced upon this strong Motive, that very many frequently saw our Christian Verities Confirmed by Signs and wonders from Heaven. Se this reason further urged. n. 12, though silently passed over by Mr Dr.

*Of what
efficacy Mi-
racles are.*

7. Chap: 8. I shew how efficacious Church miracles have been in after Ages, and moreover prove, that those who deny them strive against God, and do their utmost to render the Conversion of Jewes and Infidels, not only difficult but impossible, and I speak of such Miracles as have been wrought by the Professors of the Roman Catholick Church, ever reputed Orthodox from the Apostles time. In confirmation whereof, I produce first S. Irenæus *Adversus Hæreticos. Lib. 2. C. 57.* Some, saith he, cast out Devils, others foretel things to come, others by laying their hands on the Sick cure them. Now also, as we said, the dead have also risen, and lived with us for many yeares. In hū. 6. Chapter, he assures us, that this Grace of working Miracles belong's only to the Catholick Church, and saith, Hereticks never restored sight to the blind, nor strength to the lame, nor wrought any such true Miracles in confirmation of their Gospel. I produced also S. Basil speaking of that worthy Bishop of Neocæsarea S. Gregory, deservedly called *Thaumaturgus*, who removed à Mountain from the place it was in, and none ever yet doubted or questioned the admirable works of this glorious Saint. S. Athanasius and S. Hierome amply relate the Miracles of S. Hilarion, as Severus Sulpitius doth the wonders of S. Martin Bishop of Tours in France. And the same S. Hierome. *Lib. adversus Vigilant: c. 4.* saith, that the Signs and wonders wrought in the

*Ancient Fa-
thers most
plain for
Miracles
wrought in
the Church*

Tem-

Temples of Martyrs prove highly beneficial both to Believers, and the Incredulous. S. Ambrose *Epist: 85* was an Eye-witness of strange Miracles done by the Reliques of S. Gervasius and Protasius, for proof whereof he appeals to the sense and judgement of those who saw them. *You have known, saith he, nay you have seen many dispossessed of Devils, many when they touched the Garments of Saints, freed from their Infirmities.* S. Austin. *Lib: 22 de Civitat: c. 8.* is most copious in relating the Miracles wrought by the glorious Martyr S. Stephen; And *Lib: contra Epist. Fundam. cap. 4. 5.* asserts that the true Church of Christ, is proved and demonstrated by Miracles.

S. Austins
judgement.

8 These most evident Testimonies which evince glorious Miracles to have been wrought in the Church distinct from those registred in *Holy Writ*, our wise Dr takes little notice of, though I clearly laid them before his eyes with à further enlargement on every particular, and expected an Answer, But in lieu of this he blames me, because I shew our Saviours Prediction of more numerous and greater Miracles exactly fulfilled. I could wish he had perused better S. Chrysostom's whole Book against the Pagans.

Tomo 5. where speaking of S. Babylas Martyr, he shews that our Saviour's Prophecy was verified, not only in the cures wrought by S.

What the
Dr Cavil's

Peters shadow and S. Pauls garments, but moreover by the Reliques and Monuments of Saints, namely S. Babylas, and from thence infer's that Christ is God, who did such wonders by his Servants. But all this signifies nothing to the Dr, though

though Christ our Lord expressly saith, *that his Saints should doe greater things ; than himself had done.*

Not a word
to S. Ber-
nard, return-
ed by the
Dr.

9. Afterward I referred the Dr to our Venerable Bede, both learned and virtuous, for the undoubted Miracles of *S. Cuthbert*, and many others in England; then *n. 6.* I appealed to *S. Bernard*, who I hope may pass for an honest man in his relation of *S. Malachies life.* He had, saith *S. Bernard*, *the Gift of Prophecy, cured the sick, changed mens minds to the better, and rayssed the dead to life.* Again. Here I also introduced *S. Bernards* own Miracles, with the wonders of two other glorious Saints, *S. Dominick* and the *Seraphical S. Francis*, against whom the Dr spitt's a little venome, but hurts neither. Next to be brief (for I cannot here transcribe that whole 8 chapter) I touched upon the undubitable Miracles wrought in several places of Christendom, *Loreto, Compostella, Montaigne &c.* And finally concluded *n. 18.* with that admirable known cure wrought by *Blessed S. Xaverius* upon *F. Marcellus Mastrilli* in the City of *Naples*; as also. *c. 9.* with another evident Miracle at *Zaragoza* in *Spain*, both done in our Memory. And though in my last Treatise I urged the Dr to return an answer to these two known matters of fact, divulged the whole world over, yet his heart failed to meddle seriously with either, and replies nothing but what is to his shame, as will appear afterward.

Not of the
Miracles
most evi-
dently
wrought at
Montaigne.

10 Now before I come to weigh the Dr's weak Arguments, I will plainly discover some chiefe enormous frauds and intolerable cheats
(one

(one may rightly call them poysonable Ingredients) which he contrary to Conscience hath cast into his whole Treatise, with intention to beguile an unwary Reader.

11 One palpable cheat is, that he never distinguishes between the received Miracles of the Church, and those which particular men relate, whereof some are only probable, others dubious, and others false: These he differences not, but makes all fish that comes to his net. A Story told by James Finaughty, or Golganus, weigh's as much with him as the most Authentick Miracle recorded by S. Irenaus, or S. Austin. Hence when he touches upon à lesse certain Miracle, he often closes his discourse with this nauseous repetition. *And what is this comparable to the works of Christ and his Apostles?*

12 By Church Miracles, I first understand such as the most ancient Fathers have left upon record, never Questioned, never called into doubt by any. These are innumerable, some few and clear ones, I set down. *Reas: and Relig:* already cited, but the Dr in à surly humour galled with their Evidence, silently passes by them, not knowing what to reply. 2. I understand by Church Miracles such as in latter Ages have been approved by the *See Apostolick*, chiefly at the Canonization of Saints, whereof witnesses have been produced *upon oath*, and all imaginable Sincerity, (or Severity rather) used to avoid Impostures, and to make truth openly known. These and the forenamed Miracles our Dr unworthily account's as unvaluable, as every feigned story he rakes out of this or that pri-

*A long list
ries, of the
Drs frauds,
and open
cheats.*

*What is
meant by
Church
Miracles?*

private Author. Though Iohn an Oakes, or *Hafenmüllerus* tell it, all with him passes for à Church Miracle.

Another
unworthy
Cheat.

13. A second cheat run's through his whole ill contrived discourse, which is to perswade the Reader, that the most learned and Holy Fathers of God's Church, who plainly assert Miracles to have been wrought by the choicest Servants in it, *are open Impostors, and manifest Lyars.* The Sequel followes inevitably, for if the Dr's Arguments have any force, they evince (or prove nothing) that never since the Apostles dayes, the Church had one true Miracle wrought in it. Therefore not only the Church, notwithstanding Her great care in the examination of Miracles, but the Fathers also that produce innumerable, are plain Impostors and unexcusable Lyars. Let us se, how the Reader will relish *this desperate and Heathenish Proposition.* Yet worse followes, and it is, that Antichrist's Signes and wonders may most justly be preferred before any true Miracle registred by the Fathers, for this false Prophet will exhibit Miracles *specious in appearance* (though false) Christ's Church, saith this Doctor, Never shewed any really true. No. All are *Fourbs, Lies, Fictions, Impostures,* and what not?

14. A third cheat lies in à strange art he uses, very suitable to Atheistical humours, who believe nothing, and it is thus. To disparage these wonderful works of God, he fail's in his main enterprize, observe it well. He rejects all Church Miracles *as fourbs.* Ought not the Dr, I beseech

beseech you, to exchange Principles with us, and prove *what he denies* by as great Authority as we allege for the *contrary Affirmative*, of their being undoubted Truths? This the Godly man never attempts, but because he will have Miracles appear ridiculous, he thinks his spiteful jeering at them proof enough to decry all, as *incredible, despicable, and contemptible*. Jeers fit well men of his humour, who hold fast to what they see and *feel*, loath to trouble their braines with more, but jeers Shall not serve his turn, and therefore I shall ever urge him when we plead for Miracles by unexceptionable Witnesses, to *prove* them false, or to *grant* the fact attested.

15 A fourth Cheat undermin's the most connatural way of conveying truth either *absent, or past* to mans understanding, and is called *Humane Faith*, which has great weight, when no just exception comes against it, but the Fool-hardy spirit of unbelieving Heathens, and Hereticks. Our Saviour's own Miracles before the writing of Scripture were thus conveyed to many who saw them not, and judged prudently Credible upon Humane Authority. This Principle grounded in nature and approved by Christ, the Dr wholly invalidates, for though our *Cyrills, our Basils, our Austins, our Bernards, Bedes*, and innumerable others recount indubitable Miracles, though they point at the time *when*, and the place *where*, they were wrought, though they tell you such and such Eye-witnesses saw them; such Cures were done by the Reliques of Saints, yet Impostors they are for their pains, and guilty of that

A third Cheat, in denying all, and proving nothing.

A fourth Cheat undermin's all Humane Faith.

S enormous

What force
Humane
Faith has?

An Evident
clear Mira-
cle, wrought
at Monta-
gue,

enormous Sin of impudently deceiving the world. Pray you consider. Would not those poor Shepherds thinke ye, present at our Saviours birth have gained Credit, had they told the Inhabitants neer Bethlem what they Saw and heard that night? And shall not the word of *S. Ambrose*, or *S. Austin* be taken, while both recount Miracles seen with their own eyes? Did that blind man cured by our Saviour *John*. 9. perswade the Jewes upon his own and Parents Testimony, that he was their Son, and born blinde? And shall not à far greater number of Eye-witnesses that knew *John Clement* born monstrously lame, and whole multitudes saw him in an Instant Miraculously cured in our Ladies Chappel at Montaigne, work upon the Dr's, dull Incredulity and induce him to believe upon humane faith this most strange and evident wonder, obtained by the Intercession of the Mother of God? It happened in July. Anno 1603 in the Presence, as I said, of many Eye-witnesses, and forthwith became publick in Print and Pulpit. Sundry of the Gentlemen who attended the Earle of Hereford at that time Lord Ambassadour from England, saw and conferred with the Party, and received Satisfaction both from him, and other publick Testimonies, given of the Cure. Thus Brekeley *Protest: Apolog: speak's. Tract 2. c. 3. Sect. 7. Subd: 5. Page (with me) 144.* And the learned *Iustus Lipsius* then living at Lovain not far from Montaigne, relates most largely the whole Story in his Book intituled. *Divæ Sichimienfis, five Aspricollis.* Antwerp print 1605. C. 45.

16 Now because I only gave à glance at this

this Miracle, *Reas. and Relig. Disc. 2. c. 8. n. 17* whereof the Dr takes no notice, I will here very briefly set down the Substance as *Lipsius* relates it. *Erat*, saith he, *Bruxellæ &c.* There ^{upon Iohn} was at *Bruxells* *Iohn Clement*, Son to *Iames Clement*, ^{Clement,} born *lame*, weak, and of a monstrous misshapen ^{amply relat-} body; his leggs and feet contracted were turned upward, ^{ed by Lipsius} so that his knees and thighes joyned close to his brest and belly: That lump of his body gathered round like a Ball made the poor Patient, unfit to stand, lie down, or walk, and for that reason alwaies sate, forced by the help of his hands and two Crutches to push himself forward, whereupon the People who daily gave this Iohn reliefe, usually called him in their vulgar language: *Hansken in't schotelken*. Little Iohn in a dish. In this afflicted condition; often hearing of the great Miracles wrought at *Montague* he hoped to find help and comfort in that holy place, whither he was carried in a wagon, and having confessed his Sins, performed his Penance, ^{The whole} and received the Blessed Sacrament, feeling him self ^{manner of} full of pain; he endeavoured to creep out of the Church ^{the cure,} for a little refreshment of Air, but could not stir; ^{declared.} Whether he would or no, he was forced to remain that whole day in the same place. Evening comming on, Solemn Laudes were sung, and this Patient, as he sate before the high Altar felt him self lifted up from the ground, when behold, his contracted and wrested feet, wholly loose, were stretched out, then also the doublet wherein his body was bound, burst assunder, and he in a moment stood bolt up. Other cloaths being brought, his strength and vigour more and more increased, his small dried leggs, were then filled with flesh and blood, And which is another wonder, a wound in his head, which he had received 15. dayes

What Iudge-
ment the
best physi-
tians made
of it.

before, yet wide open, shut it self close together in that very time, he was cured. This whole multitudes saw, This at his return to Lovain and Bruxells he related, when People ran out to see and meet him &c. I have, saith Lipsius, heard the most expert Physicians of no easy Faith exclaime, and openly profess, that this cure vvras vvrought by the poverful hand of God, above the force of nature.

Czso

All Excep-
tions made
against the
Miracle
wrought on
John Cle-
ment, are
evidently
improbable.

17 Please now, couteous Reader, to parallel this Miracle with that of the blind man in the Gospel, and ask what disparity can the Dr give between them, or what exceptions can he make to this latter strange wonder? Will he say, Iohn Clement was à Counterfeit? It's Impudence. Hundred and hundreds knew him in this miserable condition twenty yeares together after his Mothers death, who as Lipsius notes, *ventre exsecto*, dyed at his birth? Will he say, those many Eye-witnesses who beheld him cured in à moment of time, were insufficient to make the fact Credible, afterward attested and examined by publick Authority? More saw this wonder wrought upon the lame, then that other upon the blinde cured by our Saviour. Will he say, there was never such à man born lame, much less such à man cured as Iohn Clement, but that all are Lyars and Cheats who tell the Story? More justly might the Jewes have said, there was never such à man blinde as christ restored sight to, for they saw not that cure vvrought, yet believed it, upon the mans own word and his Parents, and therefore advised him, to glorify God for the favour done, though their obstinacy would not ascribe the Miracle to Christ. O! but here is

is à disparity. Scripture recount's the one Miracle; not the other. A most simple reply. We now insist upon *humane Authority*, and ask (which is ever to be noted) whether upon *that ground*, the latter Miracle be not made more credible than the first, and here we are told, *the one is believed by Faith*, because God saies so, and *not the other*. All the Miracles Christ wrought were presupposed true before the writing of Scripture, and not first true, because they are registred in that Book.

18 This humane Faith utterly ruined by our Dr, the Erudite *Lipsius* plead's by, and presses home. *cap. 1. Vbi estis, qui paulò vetustiora elevatis &c.* Where are you who extenuat and undervalue ancient Miracles? *Ecce nova novitia*, behold new ones done in the Eyes of us all, and heard vvith our eares, renowned and solemnized by the frequent concourse and applause of People with great benefit to Nations. *Qua fides potest esse in rebus humani si hac non est?* What faith can there be amongst men, if these things gain not credit? And therefore he saith in his Preface. *Those deserve not to be called men that boggle at, or doubt of such illustrious vvonders*, yet à *Ieer*, à *Pish*, and *Flurt* of our Dr's finger seem's forcible enough to discredit these admirable, and no less manifest Testimonies of God's power, publickly shewed to the world.

19 More Cheats and fallacies of this Dr will better appear in the ensuing Discourse. Here is one more, and gross enough. He never refutes the known and certain Miracles of the Church, but now laugh's at one less certain,

This Miracle at Montague proclaimed all over.

A 2^d Cheat.

By what
Miracles,
we argue.

now at another related, as I said by private Authors, prudently judged over credulous in writing matters upon *Hearsay*. These support not our cause, for we plead, as S. Austin did by Miracles, *Multitudine, & magnitudine, conspicuus, undeniable*, and thus our Saviour Argues. *John 15. 24. The vvorks vvwhich I have done (not one vvork) no other has done. Acts. 2. Many vvonders and Signs vvvere. vvrought by the Apostles in Hierusalem.* What, if false or doubtful Scriptures have been forged under the Apostles names, as manifest happened in the Primitive times, must we therefore reject the true Scriptures already received? Yet this fallacy or cheat, is à main Prop to the very most of our Dr's rambling discourse, as shall be shewn afterwards.

A first Cheat
grounded
upon the
Strangeness
of Miracles.

Miracles
recorded in
Scripture,
more ridicu-
lous to A-
theists, than
Church Mi-
racles.

20 A Second Cheat is, that when à Miracle appears strange or ridiculous to the Dr's fancy, he slights it as counterfeit, turn's it off with à libe, and well instruct's Atheists and Heathens to deride the Miracles related in Scripture. For what can be more ridiculous to an Atheist then to read of *Moses* his horned face? Of *Balaams* Ass speaking? Of *Samsons* destroying à thousand men with the Jawbone of an Ass, or of water issuing out of one tooth in that Jawbone, to quench the wearied mans thirst after his fighting? These and many more à Heathen Scorn's as highly as the Dr doth our most certain Church Miracles. But thanks be to God, the Church and her Miracles are not like the walls of Jericho overthrown with loud Braying, or the empty sound of à Dr's broken Trumpet, No. Christ

Christ's Sacred Doctrine, witness the Apostles though à Scandal to the Iewes and à foolery to the Gentils, yet stand's invincible against all Opposers. and so will the Church and her Miracles continue glorious to the end of Ages, maugre the attempt of Her weak Adversaries. Thus much premised we will in the next place consider the Dr's exceptions against Miracles, and ward off à few Cavils, Arguments drawn from Authority or reason I find not any, worth answering.

CHAP II.

Of the Dr's proceeding against me.

What he supposes, destroys it selfe. What weight Church Miracles have? None of wit or judgement ever contradicted them. How the Dr juggles in appealing to Apostolical Miracles. The Miraculous Translation of the sacred house of Loreto, manifestly proved against the Dr's weak and unworthy Cavils.

1. **A**fter the Dr had set down some parcels of my Discourse, and chiefly excepted against my comparing Church Miracles with those wrought by Christ and his Apostles, he thinks an Atheist would desire

no more advantage against Christian Religion, then to have it granted, that those Primitive Miracles were no other than such, as are wrought in the Roman Catholick Church. I answer The Dr either here supposes, the Church never to have had one true Miracle in it, and upon that Supposition it's madness to talk of paralleling Apostolical Miracles believed by Faith; with Miracles never in being. For who can parallel fourbs, and fancied wonders, with Apostolical Miracles, really wrought? Or Contrarywise, He supposes true Miracles, as curing the lame, dispossessing Divels, and raising the dead to have manifestly illustrated the Church! Grant this, and he is obliged to give à disparity between the Primitive wonders, and these latter in the Church. This I alwaies urged, but the Dr leaves it unanswered.

*What ought
to be suppo-
sed, for à
right Paral-
lel.*

2. Again, he perswades himselfe of great advantage given to Atheists (who as much slight the Apostolical Miracles as those of the Church) I see no such matter, and therefore Say contrary, and have proved it. If Church Miracles be rejected, the plainest Evidence of Credibility fail's, and if Christian Religion be made thus bare and naked of glorious Marks, Atheism get's so much ground, that neither Christ nor his Miraeles can gain belief of any: For, undermine the Church, and that is done, if you rob her of her Miracles and other Motives, Scripture it selfe, and the very wonders of Christ lose credit, and goe to wrack also, because the certainty we have of These, relies upon Church Authority, utterly discredited, when as the Dr, would have it, you
expose

*How all
faith is
ruined.*

expose her without Lustre, and thereby make her ^{The Dr's} contemptible to Jewes, who anciently had true ^{Atheism.} Miracles amongst them, and ridiculous to Gentils. Here is your Atheism, good Mr Doctor.

3. In the following page. 439. He enquires after the credibility of the ancient Miracles and the latter of the Church, and tells us *two things are agreed on to make up sufficient credibility in a Testimony. Viz. The knowledge and fidelity of the persons who deliver it, If they speak nothing but what they were witnesses of, and never gave suspicion of fraud and deceit, and offered the highest ways of proof concerning their fidelity, then it is an unreasonable thing to disbelieve them.* This faith he, is the case of those, who recorded our Saviours, and his Apostles Miracles &c. Hear now my reply. But S. Irenaeus, S. Ambrose, S. Austin and the other Fathers already cited, were such certain witnesses, and never gave any suspicion of fraud: Their Authority, great Sanctity and worth, was Proof enough of their own fidelity. Therefore the Dr's Consequence holds good for all the Miracles, these blessed men have attested. ^{The Dr's} *Viz. It is an unreasonable thing* ^{Consequence} *returned* ^{upon himsel-} *not to believe them.* In the next place, the Dr juggles in appealing to those who recorded our Saviours Miracles, for either he look's upon these wonders, *as they are matters of Faith* because recorded in Scripture, and that's nothing to our present purpose: Or, *consider's them as seen or heard,* by Humane faith, before the Evangelists wrote them. Here we come close to the Dr and assert, that not only the Miracles which S. Ambrose and S. Austin saw, but the latter also in the

*Miracles
of undoubted
Credit.*

the Church, namely, the Miraculous cure of F. Mastrilli in Naples; of the young man who had his leg restored by the Intercession of our Blessed Ladie at Zaragosa, of Iohn Clement's stupendious cure, seen and attested by innumerable witnesses, are upon *humane Faith* most certain. Of These, and the like openly known works of God we speak, manifestly clear from all impostures, and say they were never disproved by any, Friend or Enemy. Let therefore the Dr. either plainly discredit such, or hereafter desist from impugning *known Miracles*.

*Miracles
approved by
the Church
never doub-
ted of by
pious men.*

4 He goes on. P. 440. *The greatest number of Miracles in the Roman Church have been believed upon the credit of fables and uncertain reports. Mark first à shuffling. The greatest number, saith he. Speak out Dr. Are any true, or, are all false? If these three only now mentioned, be true (as hundreds more are) and all the Spight in Hell shall never prove one of them false, there is enough to stop your mouth with. Again, saith he. The Miracles in the Roman Church have been believed upon uncertain reports. That is, some over Credulous have believed so, as many anciently upon uncertain reports believed false Gospels, for true ones. What's this to our purpose? The only difficulty is, whether those we call Church Miracles, I mean such as have been strictly examined upon oath by the Prelates of the Church, and after examination approved (we have innumerable of these) can be evinced counterfeit, or forged? It is à flat Calumny to account these fabulous. The Dr adds. The greatest number of those who delivered the Miracles in the Roman Church have*

have been contradicted by men of greater Authority than themselves. I answer the Church herself hath contradicted many fabulous Miracles, with great punishment laid on the Impostors, and therefore strictly command's her Prelates to use all diligence in the Examination of Miracles, before they be approved. Of these we speak, and know the Dr err's grossly, in saying such approved Miracles have been contradicted by men of great authority. What man in his wits ever contradicted the Miracles seen by S. Ambrose and S. Austin or the visible boyling up of S. Ianuaries blood, manifest to thousand and thousand Eye-witnesses? Or, not to entertain the Reader with an endless repetition of most certain known Miracles upon record, who can without impudence boggle at the Miracle of S. Xaverius wrought upon F. Mastrilli, or call into doubt, that other cure at *Zaragoza*,? These and innumerable more of the like quality, we urge and boldly assert, the Dr shall never speak a probable word against them.

5. What followes in the Dr. P. 441. is above all expression simple. None of these persons, saith he, ever laid down their lives to attest the truth of any of their Miracles. Very wisely objected! Did the blinde man cured by our Saviour. *John. 9.* lay down his life to attest the truth of the Miracle wrought upon him? Did S. Peter, S. Paul, or any Apostle offer themselves to death, or dye, for a proof of their Miracles? No. They lost their lives to attest the truth of the Gospel, which God pleased to confirm by Miracles, and so thousands and thousands Witnesses have done to attest

attest the truths taught by the Roman Catholick Church, after innumerable Spectators had seen Miracles and solemnly sworn, that what they had seen, was true. Is not this proof enough (matter of damnation if perjured) to gain believe from wise and prudent men?

6. Next we are to attend the Dr, who tells us he is going on Pilgrimage to our Lady at Loreto, to view the Authentick Monuments and Miracles Brought there. He had done more wisely had he kept at home, or pretended à pilgrimage to the man in the Moon, (some think men are there), though its hard to get so high, And in the Dr's Principles, its wholly as difficult, to find out any *Miraculous Chappel* at Loreto, yet he in all hast is posting thither to pull that Chappel down, which in his judgement neither is, nor ever was in being. Of this we are to speak more largely.

*The Miraculous Translation of the
Chappel of Loreto, defended against
the Doctor. Authorities for the
Translation, Produced.*

7. **T**O proceed clearly. First its evident that à little House or Chappel, has stood at Loreto without Prop, support, or reparation well nigh the space of four hundred yeares, and its much, that *an old house*, as the Dr *Scornfully* calls it, should remain so long unchangeable, and have no material Foundations to stand upon. 2. Its evident, that this Chappel

Chappel was never first built at Loreto by any hands, for grant this, the report of its being translated thither, would have been blasted, ^{Evidences for the} thoughts à cheat, and made ridiculous the ^{Chappels Translation,} whole World over. All would have said, in such

à year, by such à Benefactor, this Chappel was erected as appears upon record, and some eyes who saw it built there, would have left à memory of it to Posterity, which ^{Of the great veneration given to the} would soon have taken off all respect and ^{Chappel,} veneration to the place. Whereas, the contrary is evident, Popes, Princes, Prelates,

Great ones and wise, rich and poor, Christians and Turks, highly reverence and honour the place, and therefore have enriched it with many noble Donaries. Were all these men think yee worse then besotted, when they parted with their Goods to honour à few bare stones which à companie of Bricklayers about Loreto, some time or other, heaped together, and made à house of? Again, who ever built à house or Chappel without material Foundations? This Sacred Chappel hath none, but stand's upon it's own weight without Support and so also it stood in Dalmatia. 3.

As Silvester Petra Sancta Observes. Volum : ^{This 3. volume is contained in his}

3. *Thaumasia*, under the Title. *Miracula perpetua.* Cap. 3. P. 30. Though the Stones of ^{2. Tome.}

this Chappel in colour and figure appear like Brick, yet in real truth they are true Stones ^{The stones of the Chappel,} as hath been tried, and of such à nature, as ^{not found in} are not to be found in Picenum (now ^{Europe,} called Marcà Anconitana) nor in all Italy, nor in any part of Europe. From whence

ce this Author infer's that the house was

Mira

miraculously translated, and not built by *Workmen at Loreto*. These Arguments which I hold unanswerable the Dr takes no notice of, but jogg's on in his pilgrimage, how and in what manner, we shall presently discover.

8 In the mean while, please to hear briefly the story of this Chappels Miraculous Translation. *Horatius Torsellinus* relates it at large in five books. *Silvester Petra Sancta* now cited, more compendiously, *Canisius*, *Cardinal Baronijs*, *Bzovius*, and others write of it.

*S. Hierome
and S. Paula
visited this
Chappel.*

9. This Holy house, where the Angel saluted the Blessed Virgin, and Christ our Lord had his education with his sacred Mother, and S. Joseph, stood first in Nazareth. *S. Hierome*, lib. 8. c. 30. and *Epist. ad Eusebium*, 27. who visited the place with *S. Paula*, a noble Roman Lady, call's it *Nutriculam Domini*, the Nurcery of our Saviour, and was in great veneration even after the Saracens had taken Hierusalem. There the generous Commander *Tancredus* when that most Christian *Heros*, *Godfrey of Bullion*, had taken Hierusalem, enriched this Chappel with noble Donaries, then standing in the Church which *Helena* the Emperesse had built about it. *Se Tyrus*, lib. 3. *belli Sacri*. There *Jacobus Vitriacus* Patriarch of Hierusalem sometimes said Mass, on the Feast of the Annuntiation. *Se Jacobus Vitre in Descript Terra sancta*. Finally, *S. Lewis* the most Christian King and 9.th of France, after much sufferance in that holy war, would not return from Palestine before he had visited this Sacred house which he did with all veneration on the Anniversary day of our Lady. *March. 25. Se Ludovicus*

*Who on vi-
sited it?*

*S. Lewis
prayed da-
voutly there.*

Elicou.

Elison. Serm: de S. Ludovic: To relate here how all Palestine was lost, and made subject to Christs Enemies would be too long a work, and no way to my present purpose. The Reader is yet to know, that the Miraculous Transmigration of this house soon followed the last overthrow given to Palestine, when the King of Egypt conquered by force Tripoli, and *Postulman*, the only Holds left poor Christians in Syria. This happened in the Month of April Anno 1291. See *Ioan: Villan. lib. 7.* a known Historian.

10. The next Month after, and the same year, *VII. Idus Maras*, The house was Miraculously carried by the power of God and his Angels from Nazareth many thousand Italian Miles to the Countrey of *Illyricum*, or part of it, Called *Dalmatia*, and stood neer *Teractum* and *Flume*, two sea Townes on à little Hill, as *Hierome Angelista* after à diligent search made into the Annals of *Illyricum*, amply relates. The People next morning amazed at the wonder to se à house stand there torn from its Foundations, took à view of it, circumspectly regarded the height, breadth, and little furniture within, whereof you have à more ample Description in *Turfellin. lib. 1. c. 3.* and *Silvester petra Sancta. p. 19.* These things much spread abroad, came to the knowlege of Alexander the Prelate of *Tersedum*, who then lay very sick in bed. The virtuous Prelate (dear faith *Turfellin* to God and man) mighty desirous to se the Wonder, addressed himselfe by earnest prayer to the Blessed Virgin, implored her help in order to his speedy recovery, and was graciously heard.

For

When, the house was by Miracle translated?

The place where it first stood, and who saw it.

The Translation confirmed by Miracle.

The Miracle manifestly proved.

Alexander's zeal and fervour.

For behold, about midnight the Mother of Mercy enlightned the chamber where the sick Patient lay, and told him, the house he desired to se was that where *she was born*, where the Angel Gabriel brought her the tydings of conceiving by the Holy Ghost, and where in fine, the Divine Word was made flesh. Now to the end thou may'st bear witness of these things (so the Mother of God spake) and gain credit in divulging them abroad. *sanus est*. In this very moment be thou quit of thy long Infirmary, thy health is perfectly restored. This said and done: The Sacred Virgin disappearing, *Alexander*, sound, strong, and full of courage forthwith left his bed, ran to the Miraculous Chappel, and there with eyes and hands lifted up to Heaven, first gave God and the Blessed Virgin humble thanks for his cure, and afterward most Zealously declared to all in the open Streets and high wayes, what he had heard and seen; in so much that the Inhabitants there came flocking about him, and admired to se the Venerable old man, who the day before lay at deaths doore, now lively, and contrary to his gravity run up and down, and vigorously speak, as if God by à Miracle had spoken in him. *Turcellin* for these Things, cites in his margent the *Annals of Flume*, written by Hieronymus Angelita, whereof more presently.

II. 'At this very time when the worthy Prelate *Alexander* was cured, *Nicolas Frangipani* of a noble Roman Progeny, then Lord of *Terfactum* and supream Ruler of that whole Country, accurately weighing what had passed, resolved at last to send some choise men to

Naza-

Nazareth with command to enquire, whether this house yet remained there or no? Alexander, and three more deputed thither, at their arrival found in the Temple built by S. Helena where our Ladies house lately stood, that the little house had been rased from the foundations, and, as it were, taken thence by force, which manifestly appeared both by the tracks and marks left there in the Floor, or Pavement, where it had been, as also by a wide Opening made in the height of S. Helen's Temple, through which it passed. These four Persons upon their return gave a full account to the Lord Frangipanius, as also to the Inhabitants, of what they had seen, attesting that they had measured the Footsteps of the foundation, and found those exactly answerable to the dimensions of this Chappel, and withall recounted what complaints they heard from the people about Nazareth, for the losse of this great Treasure, which Alexander upon several occasions publicly preached, and made known all over.

12. Three yeares and seven months the Chappel remained in Dalmatia, when behold, towards the middle of December, that is Anno 1294. it passed over the Adriatick sea, and came to Picenum a part of Italy, and there placed in a wood belonging to a pious Matrone of Recanati, called Laureta, had from her the name of Loreto. The Shepherds who kept their watch both day and night, first made a discovery of it by a clear light, that environed the place. All those about Recanati upon the fame of this wonder, flocked thither, Here the Blind, the Lame, and innumerable infirm, recovered their

T

sight

How disco-
vered?

fight, limbs, and health, whereat the good Lady Laureta had as much joy, as the Dalmatians sorrow upon the Chappels departure. Eight months expired, it left the wood, and went one mile neerer *Recanati*, where placed on a hill appertaining to two Brothers, it stayed not full out four months, but by God's special Providence and power, settled it where it is at present, now called *Loreto*. If you ask why it changed Postures so often in so short a compass of time, and enobled so many places with its Presence, God only, conscious of all truths, knowes best. By conjectures we may guess, that these several Transportations happened, to leave in the minds of all prudent men an *absolute assurance* concerning *this matter of Fact*, of its being thus translated from place to place.

More proofs
of the
Chappels
Translation.

13. The proofs whereof are evident. First, the forementioned Lord *Frangipanius* built at *Terfactum*, where our Ladies Cell once stood, another Chappel just of the same bigness with it, called *S. Maria à Terassto*, and in Memory of it, and the evident Miracles wrought there while it was in Dalmatia, encompassed his newly erected Chappel with a very Magnificent Church, like that of *S. Helen's* in Nazareth, yet to be seen at this day, with an inscription in Marble thus. *Hic est locus &c.* Here is the place where once, that Holy house of our Blessed Lady stood, and this saith Turfelin. lib. 1. cap. 9. many worthy men of great credit have seen and most sincerely related to me. In *Picenum* also, where the house remained in a wood, while *That* was in being (for now it's cut down) there appeared demonstrable Signs in the very Plas of ground where

where the Chappel was, as *Hieronymus Angelita* in his History of Loreto dedicated to Pope *Clement the seventh*, recount's, and *Raphael Riera* à worthy known man assured me, *saieth Tursellin*, that he had often seen that lovely pleasant Plat of ground, with great content and devotion, who to preserve à memory of it, enclosed it in à wall just of the same *Longitude* and *latitude* with that of our Ladies chapel. And this, adds *Tursellin*, I have seen with my own eyes. Some Tokens, though not so clear of this Sacred house, yet appear in that Hill of the *Two Brothers* by à heap of earth cut out of the Hill, and cast up there. Se *Tursellin. Cap. 9. Fine.*

14. Notwithstanding the manifest proofs already intimated, which shew the Translation of this house to have been Miraculous, yet the Gentry of *Picenum* in à General meeting, induced thereunto by those of *Recanati*, resolved for *greater Security*, to have the whole matter examined anew, and therefore upon publick charges, appointed *Sixteen choise men*, first to pass over into *Dalmatia*, and from thence to *Palestine*, for further Satisfaction. When these Deputies came to *Tersacum*, they found à lively memory among all People of this Sacred house once placed there, and afterward taken from thence, whereof that Signal and never to be forgotten Monument of honour still remained, which the Lord *Frangipanius* had built, to wit, of another Chappel just like that of our Ladies, encompassed in à larger Church, as is already observed. From hence these Deputies departed for *Nazareth*, happily arrived there, and

Other Evidence.

Of the Lord
Frangipanius his
Monument.

saw the Foundation of the house raised from the Floor of S. Helens Church, wherewith it was environed, and à passage open in the vault, as we have related. Upon the faithful information of these *sixteen Messengers* returned to Pice-num, the fame of this sacred Cell became more and more renowned, God confirming *the several Translations of it from place to place*, by innumerable Miracles. Yet after all this done, Pope Clement the 7.th to avoyd all forgery, and have greater Assurance, sent three prudent men of his own Family first to *Dalmatia*, then to *Nazareth*, with an expresse Command that they should examin all things accurately, and set down in their Note-books every particular appertaining to the measure and form of the translated Chappel. These Messengers came first to *Tersactum*, and saw there the Chappel erected by the Lord Nicolas Frangipanius, and withall heard the pious complaints of the Inhabitants thereabout, who lamented the losse of that highly valued treasure taken from them.

*Messengers
again sent,
by Pope
Clement.*

*Their jour-
ney, and*

*Further
Voyage, to
Nazareth.*

15. From *Tersactum* in Dalmatia, they undertook à further *Voyage* to Nazareth, and there in S. Helen's Church found in the Pavement of it, as is now said, the exact measure of our Ladies Chappel, and all particulars answerable to the Relation hitherto given. Besides, to comply with the Popes command, they enquired of those who lived thereabout, whether any memory yet remained of the Translation of the house from thence? All unanimously answered, the memory of that house was undoubted, and yet preserved amongst them.

them. These three returning, who brought with them some of the Stones left in the foundation of our Ladies Chappel, gave Pope Clement full Satisfaction, and made the several Translations already mentioned undoubted.

Account given, of their journey.

16. Wherefore that worthy Provost, *Petrus Georgius Teremanus*, one of great integrity and prudence, who many years governed the house of Loreto, published in the time of Pope *Pius* the second, a short, plain, Relation of this Chappel for the benefit of all Pilgrims, wherein the Substance of what you have now heard, is comprised, and for a further Confirmation of all; Two Citizens of *Recanati*, *Paulus Rinalduccius*, and *Franciscus* Prior, well known most honest and virtuous, attested and deposed upon oath before the Provost *Teremanus*, what they had understood concerning the Transmigration of this house. The first *Rinalduccius* swore, he had often heard his Grandfather say, that he saw with his own eyes the house carried over the sea and placed in the wood at *Recanati*, whither the old man with others often repaired for devotion. The second *Francis* Prior witnessed, that he also had heard his Grandfather 120. years old, yet perfect in his Senses, openly avouch, that he with others had frequently gone to visit the Chappel while it stood in the wood, and on the Hill of the two Brothers, and this also *Hieronymus Angelita*, the constant Secretary of the City *Recanati*, in his History of *Loreto*, has left upon Record. Now to shew you the fidelity of the Provost *Teremanus*, please

Teremanus published his relation.

What two sworn Witnesses deposed?

Hieronymus Angelita his Testimony.

*Teremanus,
much pray-
sed, by the
Bishop of
Recanati.*

to read the great Commendations given him by *Nicolas Asinius* Bishop of *Recanati*, one most eminent for learning and Sanctity, who not only bestowed great Almes towards the Maintainance of Pilgrims resorting to *Loreto*, but liberally also assigned the fruits of many *Manors* he had for the same end, to that holy place. You may read the worthy Bishops own words, and the *Elogium* given of *Teremanus* in *Tursellin. Lib. 1. c. 28.* where he is called à venerable man, one most Devout, Sincere, and faithfull.

*The improbabilities the
Dr must
devour,
without ene
witness for
him.*

17. Now if you account all these particulars upon Record fictions, while so many great Authors, and different Nations, *Palestine, Dalmatia, and Italy* give Testimony of them; If you will say, that the four men sent from *Dalmatia*, those Sixteen from *Picenum*, and three from the Court of *Rome*, either never undertook such à Journey, or at their return (worse then Divels) betrayed their trust, in forging abominable lyes; If you will say, that as often as the pious Pilgrims come from *Dalmatia* to *Loreto*, who with sighs bemoan the Translation of this house from them, are besotted; If you will say, many Eye-witnesses that saw at *Tersactum* à Chappel built by the Lord *Frangipanius* in memory of this house, had only à Spectre and no real thing before their eyes; If you will say, that that worthy Provost *Petrus Georgius Teremanns*, who many years had care of this Chappel, was an Impostor, or an impudent lyar; If you will say, those two sworn witnesses Citizens of *Recanati*, were perjured persons; If you will say,

say, that à Secretary of à whole City durst write things, *which if false*, would with clapping of hands, have been *disdainfully exploded*; If you wil say, that à most Holy and wise Bishop *acted à fools Part*, in giving away his meannes to uphold à meer cheat in mens memory, and spend his breath to praise à man who deserved the Gallows had he so notoriously fooled the world, as the Dr would have us to believe. If finally, all these Particulars, still upon Record, and preserved by à never interrupted tradition Age after age in so many Nations, are to be esteemed fourbs and forged tales, *I have done, and must conclude, that humane faith* worth nothing, ought to be thrown^{out} of the world, for there is no believing any thing.

18. Yet one word more to confirm the verity of this Story. First its evident, such à Chappel stand's now at Loreto frequented by all sort of People, and as I noted above, it is most clear, that no hands ever laid so many Stones together, or built it there. The house, however little, did not *like à Mushroom* start out of the earth, by night, or in à moment of time. Divels, where the *Immaculate virgin* is still honoured, placed it *not there*. What then followes? But that God by his Omnipotent power transfer'd it from Country to Country, and to preserve à Memorial of his *Son Christ Iesus*, and the *Virgin Mother*, at last fixed it where it is now is, to the great joy of all Christians. This reason alone, I hold so rational and convincing, that the Dr with all his *intrigues and windings*, shall never dare to Confute it. Again. The

*A further
Confirmation.*

Two memo-
rable Cir-
cumstances,
related by
Petra San-
cta.

Erudite *Silvester* relates upon his certain knowledge two Memorable things for my present purpose. p.34. and.35. Where he tell's us, that he lived at Loreto three whole yeares, and there had often discourse with the then Count of *Terfactum*, called also *Nicolas Frangipanius*, Heir and Successor to that other *Nicolas*, who first received the welcome house into his Dominions. This Count saith *Silvester*, frequently spake with me of the Chapels Miraculous Transportation, and once in à pleasant innocent mood told me, that he would by Law accuse the *Italians* of rapin for taking from him, and his Ancestors so precious à Treasure, were it not (added he) that the Angels of à higher Court carried it away, (with whom I must not contest) and that the Mother of God had right to place her own House, where she pleased.

19. The other Testimony He relates thus. P.35. While I was at Loreto, à Noble Man, though à Sectary came thither, who had often heard from the Calvinists, that the whole Story of the house of Loreto was à meer fiction. I, said he, having an ample fortune and desirous to travel, first went to *Nazareth*, thence to *Terfactum*, and at last, as you se, am arrived at Loreto, and have found after diligent enquiry, that all things wholly agree with the Narration I read in this place, and ingeniously confessed, Saith *Petra Sancta*, that all is most true, no wayes feigned, devised, or counterfeit. The like assurance, I had, from his fellow Travellers, and Servants. Thus *Silvester Petra Sancta*.

C H A P. III.

The Dr's ridiculous cavils at Teremanus his Table, shew'd Nonsense. The main Objection against the Chappels Translation, proposed, and solued. A difficulty moved Concerning the strange Translation of Proteſtancy into Germany and England.

I. **N**OW methinks t'is high time to return to our Dr who. p 442. Set's down the *Authentick Table* of Teremanus hung up at Loreto, wherein the very most, or the Substance of all hitherto related, is briefly Comprised. It begin's thus. *The Church of our B. Lady at Loreto &c.* Will you have more Patience to hear how the Dr refutes it, then I had in the reading. *Is not this* (they are his own words) *a very pleasant story to be matched in point of Credibility vvith the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles? VVhat do these men think in their hearts of Christian Religion, that dare avouch such ridiculous fictions as these are and impose them on the Credulity of mankind? What Say you to Dr Still? Doth not this wise and profound Answer deserve à Mitre? Observe well. Many both grave and learned recount the Story, and he with à huffe, not offering at the least proof against them, saies its ridiculous.*

*The Dr's
ridiculous
refutation.*

Witnesses

Witnesses upon Oath deposed that their Ancestours saw the Chappel carried over the Adriatick sea. It might well, saith he, have been à *Ship under sail* or some such like thing, and becauie, he will have it so, it must be *ridiculous*. What if the Dr had seen *Elias* in à fiery Chariot, or the Prophet *Habacuc* carried away by the hair of his head into Babylon, would he have judged the one to be à blazing Comet like à wheelbarrow, and the other à Crow flying through the Air? The most sage and greatest men in the world highly reverence this sacred Chappel, but he *vviser than all*, account's them fools and *ridiculous* for doing so. The learned Cardinal *Baronius* in *his Annals*, hold's the Miraculous Translation of this house most certain. Se how rudely the Dr treat's him. *Baronius*, saith he, *should have had more wit, or more honesty*, and tells us afterward, p. 472. *He was one whose Zeal carried him no further than the Popes interest*. What's this but an idle crack of à petty Ministers potgun, discharged against à most eminent and renowned Person? Should one as inferiour to the Dr, as he is to the Cardinal, publish in Print, that all his scribbling has been to gain à little vain applause of men, would he think himselfe civilly dealt with? God best knowes, how much of this is true.

*The Dr's
Slighting
Baronius,*

2. Yet we have more of the like blundering. When *Canisius* gives à fuller account of this Story, and tells us that the Angels are *Ministring Spirits*, as appear's by their transporting *Habacuc*, and *Philip*. Acts. 7. 40. Our Dr replies very gravely. *As though*, saith he;
Angels

Angels could not discharge that Ministry unless at some time or other, they took away an old house and mounted it into the Air. Is not this to answer pertinently think ye? Tursellin lib. 1. c. 6. recount's that the trees while the Chappel passed by, made lowly reverence to it. A jeer refutes all. It seems, saith the Dr, they bowed so low, that they could never recover themselves after. And might he not as well have scorned that stately tree which reverently bowed to our Saviour, witness Sozomenus. lib: 5. Cap. 21, and Nicephorus Lib: 10. c. 31. But this is the usual trick of our Dr when put hard to it for an Answer, to what pleases not, he makes short work, look's big, and laughs at it. Hence he slights those two witnesses Renalduccius, and Francis Prior, who attested upon oath that their Ancestors had seen the Chappel, and often visited it, scornfully calling them two Affidavit men, though he has not one Affidavit man, that ever questioned their Fidelity. After this strain, he slights that exact Historian Hieronymus Angelita because, forsooth, he wrote his Story in Clement the 7th. time, too late as the Dr thinks, and dedicated it to the Pope. Thus he slights the Authentick Table of the pious Provost Teremanus with one simple Demand. Was ever so great à Miracle better attested than this? Reflect Gentle Reader. May this new mode passe Current in refuting Authors of known integrity by jeers, and asking impertinent Questions, you may cast all History aside, and let ranting, flouts, and Ironies have place, Dr Still: tells you it must be so, having little els to fill his book with,

The impertinent Cavils of our Dr, laid forth.

Jeers and Ironies the Dr's best and only Authors.

nor

nor so much as one Author to oppose these Testimonies.

3. In the mean while, perhaps some thing better may occur, but its only the old rubbish, former Hereticks have turned over to furnish the Dr with, and he ought to thank them for it. Here in à word lies the Chief charge, and in effect all that can be said. Three Writers, *Dantes Aldigerius*, *Franciscus Petrarcha*, and *Ioannes Boccassius*, that prosecuted the Italian History in the fourth Century, after the year one thousand, never mentioned the Miraculous translation of this house. And what saies our Dr, is it credible that so great à Miracle should happen in those dayes without notice taken of it, by such inquisitive men? Besides. *S. Antonin* of Florence speaks not à word of it, and which is more. *S. Vincentius Ferrerius*. Sermon: de Assump. B. V. positively assert's, that the Chamber of our Lady was still in Nazareth. And though the former are negative Testimonies (adds the Dr) yet they cannot be rejected by us, because we often make use of them as appear's by the Story of Pope Ioan. For *Baronius* saith, that the not recording it, or the Silence of so long à time after, wherein there was just occasion to mention it, was more then à thousand Witnesses to prove the falsity of it. And if silence be à thousand Witnesses on their side, I hope it may be at least five hundred on ours. Thus Mr Dr. And afterward upon an other occasion. p. 472. harp's much upon the same string, and highly applaud's *Baronius* his excellent rule. Viz. What soever is delivered by later Authors concerning the matters of

Antiquity,

The only
Argument
of Hereticks,
against the
Chappels
Translation
Drawn from
the Silence of
Authors,

An Argument
taken
out of *Baro-
nius* speak-
ing of Pope
Ioan.

Antiquity, and is not confirmed by the Authority of some ancient Writer, is condemned. By this rule in all these matters (saith our Dr) let us stand or fall. Jam content, Mr Dr, and before I solve the difficulty can easily preacquaint you with another great wonder, never mentioned, never taken notice of by any Author, but most silently pass'd over by all ancient Writers, yet you and all Protestants, hold it unquestionably true.

4. In the year 1517. there appeared in Germany à very strange Machine (our Dr will have it well nigh as old as the Chappel at Loreto) called by some, if not the whole, at least the best Part of the House of the living God, that is, his Church, which should (had it been built by Jesus Christ) be more worth then à little Chappel. Not to keep you longer in Suspence, I mean by this Machine the whole Essential Fabric of Protestancy, and beseech you mistake me not, but mark well what I enquire after? By Protestancy, I do not understand the Common Tenets of Christian Religion, but the very essentials of this Novelty as it differs or is distinguished, by its reformation from that, which some Scornfully call Popery, and all condemned Heresies, whereof I have treated more largely. Reas: and Reliq: Disc: 1. c. 20. n. 1. Thus much supposed.

5. It is most clear that this fancied Choise part of God's house appeared in Germany such à year, and from thence (to say nothing of other Transmigrations) Crossed the sea, and got into England. All this is evident. Now futher. But no ancient Writer ever told the world where

A great wonder held by protestants, never mentioned by ancient Author,

Who conveyed this
new Machi-
ne of prote-
stancy into
Germany
and Eng-
land?

Silence, and
a destructive
Negative,
the only
grounds of
Protestancy.

where this Protestancy had been *before Luther*, or from what remote Part of the world it *first came*, or finally, who first transported it into Germany, therefore according to the Dr's rule, it justly deserves contempt. Shall I speak more plainly? The *essential Structure* of Protestancy, say Sectaries, was ever in being from the time of Christ and his Apostles, Three dayes before Luther it was *not in Germany*, yet afterwards got thither, we seek for witnesses and would have *this matter of fact* plainly attested by some ancient *Writer*. And is not the Dr, think ye when pressed thus home, obliged to produce his *Writers and witnesses*? One Author as credible as *Termenius*, one witness as faithful as *Renalduccius* shall content me. You, Mr Dr, make the *Essentials of Protestancy* Marvellously ancient. Make this out, Tell us. who were the Professors of it? Where they lived? Did ever man or Angel bring you the newes of this *Machin's Translation* from any Part of the world? Were any ever sent in such or such an Age to Nazareth, Dalmatia, or Italy, that slightly mention it? Writers and witnesses you have none, deep Silence therefore, and this destructive Negative (*No man though most inquisitive ever wrote of Protestancy in former Ages*) are the best and only Supports of it. We have often demanded Satisfaction to this particular, yet never had it, nor shall hereafter have any, whereof I am so Confident that I challenge the Dr to Discuss this one particular with me in a Treatise apart, and I desire he would consider upon it.

6. It may be he will answer, the Essentials of *Protestancy* were carried hither and all the World over with Holy Scripture. I have prevented this Cavil in the place now cited, and told the Dr, it is impossible to find in the whole Bible so much as one Essential Tenet of this Religion as it is *Protestancy*, or called à reformed Religion, which point I also engage to examine with him, when he pleases. I answer 2. More numerous and far graver Authors (to say nothing of Church Authority) contradict this phansied conveyance of *Protestancy* with Scripture, than ever opposed the Translation of our Ladies cell from Nazareth. Perhaps the Dr will Say. The difficulty now agitated concern's not Religion which is à thing wholly Spiritual, and depend's not on History, as the Translation of à house doth. No good Dr, rub your forehead à little. When you Simply talk of that ancient Faith from whence the Roman Church once swerved, must not you either pretend History for your Assertion, and tell us *when or in what Age it swerved*, or speak Non-sense? Again. Spiritual things, Religion chiefly, are both real, and of greatest concern, and ought we not to enquire, *how and when* they are conveyed to us? Should now à new Sect of Hereticks arise, and set abroad à new Learning like yours, never heard of before, shall we not demand think ye, as Tertullian did Anciently? *Qui estis vos?* Who are you? *Vnde?* from whence came you? *Shew your Commission*, what Authority, sent you to preach &c? These Questions we propose to you concerning the Conveyance of *Protestancy* into these Parts of the world

Not one
Essential of
Protestancy
in the whole
Bible.

A pure Evad-
sion, rejected

What Pro-
testants are
forced to
grant.

How diffi-
cult the
Protestant
Church is,
from the
Chappel
at Loreto.

The Obie-
ction Propo-
sed above,
answered.

world and you answer nothing, therefore you must either help out your cause with this Negative. No ancient Writer ever took notice of it, and so by your own Principle make it Contemptible; or ingenuously confess the truth, that *Luthers* mad brains brew'd it, first broach'd it, and poysoned *Posterity* with it. You may say, Some Parallel, this Machine of Protestancy hath with the Holy house of *Loreto*, that it stand's unsupported, or without any Foundations. If this be Miraculous, or make for its Credit, I am content, but in passing consider how unlike it is, upon another Score. The Chappel of *Loreto* hath stood where it is, well nigh four hundred years, without repair or the alteration of one Stone, but this unsteady Church of Protestancy in the compass of one Age, endlessly tampered with, changes almost every year, in so much that the old and new Structure of it, are nothing like one another.

7. Now to the Obiection proposed above, I answer. Had none within the compasse of that fourth Century after the year 1000, left à memory of this Chappels Translation, the Silence of *Dantes*, *Petrarch*, and *Boccace* would have had more weight, but when, as *Silv: Petr: Sanct: P.* 35. notes well, Three Popes. *Benedict the 12*, *Vrbán the 6*, and *Boniface the 9*, much about that time positively maintain the truth of this Miracle, as appear's by their Apostolical letters, the Silence of those others, being meerly à Negative Argument, prejudiceth not the cause at all. One reason of their Silence was the afflicted and much disturbed State of Italy in those dayes, caused first by the

Part 2. c. 4. *More VVitnesſes produced*, 45
 the abſence of popes from Rome, who early
 in that Age repaired to Avignon and made
 their Reſidence there, full *ſeventy years*. An-
 other might ariſe from that long *Schiſm* of *Two reaſons*
 fourty years, to ſay nothing of the ruin and *of ſome*
 deſtruction which followed in Italy upon the *Authors*
 bitter Enmity between thoſe *Guelphi* and the *Silence.*
Gibellins, well known to the world. Theſe and
 ſome other diſtractions, as Silveſter obſerves P.
 28. much leſſened the ſame of this Chappels
 tranſlation at the beginning, neither can it be
 any wonder, if three Writers in that Age (*not*
fully as yet informed of all particulars) ſilently
 paſſ't it over, when beſides thoſe Monu-
 ments of piety, erected by Count *Frangipa-*
nus and the Authority of the Popes now
 named, we have other witneſſes clear and
 indubitable for this matter of fact.

C H A P. IV.

*More Witneſſes produced for the Chappels
 Tranſlation. Whether Baronius
 proves Pope Ioan to have never been,
 by à Negative Argument, or Si-
 lence meerty? Of the Dr's groſſ
 Errours and unworthy dealing.*

1. **B**Eſides the Teſtimonies already alleged
 for the Tranſlation of this Chappel,
 the ſame of ſo great à wonder, alwaies contin-
 ued in Picenum by à never interrupted Tra-
 dition,

dition, where Age after Age Parents taught their Children, and Masters their Schollers, how, and in what manner the Chappel was Miraculously transported, and I hope Tradition in such matters may have some weight with our Dr. 2. A whole book was set forth in Print by the expresse command of the Bishop of *Recanati*, wherein the several Transmigrations of this house are recorded, *Petra Sancta*. P. 28. remit's the Reader to the book, though as yet I have not seen it. 3. *Flavius Blondus* in his *Italia illustratâ*, treating of *Picenum*. P. 339. tell's you where the house stand's, call's it *Celeberrimum gloriosa Virginis Sacellum*, the most renowned Chappel of the glorious Virgin, and adds this as a most certain and irrefragable proof for it; that such as by their Vowes and earnest prayers sought assistance at Loreto, have by the *Intercession of God's Sacred Mother* most certainly been heard, and obtained many favours there 1. The Dr. cannot let this Testimony pass, without Shuffling, and abusing the Author. Three frauds I observe in his Answer. First he saith, *Blondus* was Secretary to *Eugenius* the 4.th about the year 1450, a good competent time after the Miracle was said to be wrought, whereas *Bellarmino*, de *Scriptis* testifies that *Blondus* Continued his Story from Anno. 407. to his own time Anno. 1400. though he lived till the year 1440, ten years short of the Dr's. 1450, neither was *Eugenius* alive in that year 1450. being made Pope Anno 1431 and late 15 years 11. months and 12 dayes, and I am sure *Blondus* (most likely not then living) was no

Three frauds
discovered in
the Dr.

Secre-

Secretary to à dead Pope. By all you may see the Dr's pretty clinch. *About the year 1450.* 2. He tells us. *All Blondus saith is only, that there was à famous Chappel of our Lady at Loreto, as appeared by the many oblations there made.* I answer Blondus as is now noted, hath much more, of the Signal great favours, which ^{Favours obtained by the Inter-} pious and devout People obtained from Al-^{the Inter-} mighty God by the *Intercession of the Blessed* ^{of our B. Lady.} Virgin, but the Dr thought it his wisest course to clap this under Deck, for fear of Scaring his people with any thing like à Miracle, wrought by our Lady. The last shuffling the cards is worst of all. Blondus, saith the Dr, speak's of many Oblations made at Loreto, but has not one word of the Chappels Miraculous translation. I answer, while he assert's that the Chappel stand's at Loreto, and that God hath wrought Miracles there, he joyntly affirm's, it was Miraculously translated thither, upon this convincing reason already laid down, *that no bands ever built it at Loreto.* I desire the Dr to enervate this one proof, which I judge cannot ^{Mantuanus Testimony} be well answered.

2. Next we produce the clear Testimony of *Baptista Mantuanus*, à Religious man of the Holy Order of Carmelits, à good Divine, and an excellent Poet, who lived with 30 more of his Order at Loreto, and Comprised the Substance of the whole story in verse, part whereof I here set down.

*Quod cernis Picentia iuxta
Littora, delubrum est illud
venerabile*

*Magna
Matris, ab Assyriis, Quod
Dij Super*

*Æquora quondam,
Huc manibus vexere suis.*

How the
Dr dispatches
Mantuan.

The Sence is. What you here see neer the Shore of *Picenum* is the venerable Temple of our great Mother the Virgin, which the Angels in time past carried from *Syria* to this place, with their own hands. Some quaint pen may perhaps match this excellent latin with an English verse, If not; let it passe, as you have it, in plain prose, while our Dr dispatches *Mantuan* with a wet finger. *Mantuan*, saith he, read the Table hanging up in the Chapel, and no wonder if he found the Story fit for a Poets brain. Very short, and very pithless.

3. Yet more, to omit *Teremanus* and *Hierom's Angelita's Testimonies*, whereof we have spoken, what can any man in his wits oppose to *Leander Albertus* one of *S. Dominick's Holy Order*, both pious and learned? Read him

him in his Description of Italy, *Turfellin. Lib:*

2. C. 28. gives you his whole relation concerning the transmigration of the house. And I think no man ever spake with greater Zeal and fervour, citing most certain Records and Monuments of Antiquity. And how think you doth our Dr slight this virtuous mans Authority? Marry, first we are told, he wrote too late, and secondly, that he seem's to rely most upon the Miracles wrought at Loreto. To the first I answer, and pray you reflect, Had either *Petrarch* or *Boccaccio* (which is not done) made mention of the Chappels translation, might not the Dr as well have excepted against them, and told us they came too late with their Stories, for both these wrote well

Leander
Albericus his
Testimony

neer à hundred years after its coming to *Dalmatia*? This Dr, it seem's, will either have matters of fact recorded presently when they happen, or is resolved to slight them, therefore I am obliged once more to remind him of his *Protestancy*, and must demand, whether any Writer ten or twenty years after Luthers revolt told him, from whence this new Nothing came into the world? To the 2.^d weak Cavil I answer, that the Miracles wrought at Loreto, do and must suppose the Chappel miraculously translated thither, If, which is evident, no mortal hands ever erected it there.

weakly ex-
cepted
against, by
the Dr.

4 Besides these Proofs, the Testimony of those Messengers sent by *Clement the 7th* to *Dalmatia*, and *Nazareth* (The Testimony is still preserved) evidently convinceth the truth of what we now speak: Consider I beseech you, whether it be likely, or in any mean measure

*These three
Messengers
relation
cannot be
doubted of.*

*What Cle-
ment the
eighth Com-
manded.*

probable, that three Choise men selected out of the Popes own Family, should be sent by the expresse command of the greatest Prelate upon earth, to take full information of every particular concerning the Chappels Translation, (which was done as you heard above) and at their return, worse then Rogues, should prove *Falsifiers of Evidences*, and fool the Pope with à meer cheat, or Flimflam Story? Here I appeal to the judgement of every prudent man for à final Sentence, that knowes how severely Popes and Princes also proceed in such matters, and ask the Dr, whether all the jeers in his boudget, can make the Pope à fool, and these witnesses *disloyal* in their relation. We go on. Pope Clement the 8th having well pondered all the Evidences in behalfe of the Chappels Translation visited Loreto, and commanded à Short Epitome of the whole Story to be engraven in à marble Table, which is as followes.

Christiane hospes &c. Christian Pilgrim, Thou that comes hither moved by thy Pious Devotion behold's here the venerable house of Loreto, renowned the whole world over by reason of most Divine Mysteries and the glory of Miracles. Here the Sacred Mother of God was born: Here She was saluted by an Angel: Here the eternal word was made flesh. Thus house the Angels first transported from

Part 2. c. 4. More Witnesses Produced, 51
 from Palestine into Illyricum neer Ter-
 saculum. Anno 1291. in the time of Pope
 Nicolas the 4.th. Three years after,
 when Pope Boniface the 8.th began his
 Reign, it was carried by the help of An-
 gels into Picenum and placed neer the
 City Recanati in a wood, where thrice
 changing place in the compass of one year,
 at last it fixed here, now from this time,
 three hundred years agoe. Since the
 Neighbouring People have admired the
 wonder; and the glory of Miracles far
 and neer spread abroad, hath gained great
 veneration among all Nations. The
 walls of this house have stood for so
 many Ages without any foundations, and
 yet remain firm and entire. Clement the
 7.th deck't it round about with a marble
 vesture. Anno 1525. Clement the
 8.th Commanded this Short inscription of
 the Chappels Translation to be engraven
 in this Stone. Anno 1595.

You have
 Pope Cle-
 ments Te-
 stimony
 in Silv:
 Petra San-
 cta cited,
 P. 31.

Subscribed.

Antonius Maria Gallus. S. R. E.

Cardinalis & Episcopus Auximi, Sanctæ
 Domus Protector.

V 4

5. What

A Consideration for the Reader.

5. What think ye, was this most Judicious Pope befotted, when he ordered the engraving of these words in marble, which would have cost him dear, an eternal reproach, could any Critick have found the least flaw in the whole Story? No wise man, much lesse Popes, wittingly run the hazard of a disgrace for toys or trifles. Few follow the Shuttle humour of Dr Still: who writes what comes into his head, right or wrong (all is one) whereof there are Instances enow in the former Treatise, and you shall have more plenty hereafter. Now,

The Drerr's in his quotation.

6. Because it is full time (after this long, though necessary Digression) to solve the other part of the objection proposed above, I will here begin with one foul error of this Dr. He tell's us. P. 451. that *S. Vincentius Ferrerius*. (E. W. admirable Saint) saith, *Serm. de Assump. B. V. That the Chamber of our Lady was still in Nazareth*. E. W. answer's, and assures Mr Dr, that *S. Vincentius* hath two Sermons upon the Assumption, and that he hath read both in two several Editions very diligently: The one in an old abbreviated Character, without the Year of our Lord, the other *Antwerp print. Anno 1573.* and E. W. thinks the Dr might have more exactly pointed at the *Sermon*, but this fault may appear little, the greater is, that *S. Vincentius* hath not one word in either *Sermon* so much as remotely like to what the Dr imposes on him. But what if. *S. Vincentius* had Spoken in Some other Sermon of our Lady as the Dr Cites, would he not, think ye have either told us, he came too late with his story, or blamed him as he doth *S. Antonin*, for writing a *Rapsody of all sorts*

sorts of Miracles? I never saw the like Strain in any man. If Authors write not of Miracles the Dr Fault's their Silence, if they write, all is *Whether Authors write or write not, the Dr blames them.* à *Rapsody*. Was there ever Man More like *Aod* both left and right handed? In case à right Thrust dispatch you not (which I never yet saw given to any Argument) à *left one* must do the deed, and and destroy you.

7. Now one word to *Baronius* his Rule, and the Dr quotes. *Annal. A. D. 853 n. 65*. Where you have another Slurr, for the number in my book (and I hold it a good one) is. N. 88. but the worser fault, is that he abuses *Baronius*, who n. 87. first refutes the Fable of Pope *Ioan* by à *solid positive Proof* Chiefly taken from the continued Succession of true Popes, and the unquestionable Authority of *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* that lived in the very year, when this *She creature* is supposed to have sate in S. Peters Chair, between *Leo the 4.th*, and *Benedict the 3.* Yet *Anastasius* present at the Election then made, expressly testifies, that Pope *Leo* being dead *Benedict Six dayes after*, was Chosen Pope, in so much that no place remained vacant for the Monster *Ioan*. Now, saith *Baronius*, when *Anastasius* saw these things, and left all upon record, and no other Author of that Age, or afterward to the dayes of *Marianus Scotus* contradicted them, the Silence of so long à time (from *Anastasius* to *Marianus*) and of so high à concern, has more force than à thousand Witnesses to blast the whole fable, when so many emergent occasions offered themselves to declare against it.

8. Here I note two egregious frands of the Dr,

*Silence
joyn'd to po-
sitive proofs,
evinces
what Baro-
nius inten-
ds.*

*Micro Au-
thors Cited.*

*David
Blundels ir-
refragable
Argument.*

Dr, one is, that he makes Silence only or à Negative Testimony the whole Proof of Baronius, whereas it's à Silence which followed upon two Positive proofs: The true registred succession of Popes, and the Testimony of Anastasius. No man, saith Baronius ever contradicted him, no Writer opposed him, and this negative joyned to à positive proof, is à manifest Evi&tion. Besides, had our Dr read Bellarmin. lib. 3. *de Romano Pontifice* c. 24. 5. *Deinde non solus*. He might have found that not only Anastasius, but Ado also, Bishop of Vienne in France who lived at that very time, Rhegino, Abbas *Vrspergensis*, Otho *Frisingensis* and all other writers, place Benedict the Immediate Successor to Pope Leo: so doth David Blundel the Historian of Amsterdam, in à whole book set forth against the Fable of Pope Ioan, and though he was à Sectary, yet overcome with the evidence of truth, he demonstratively Shewes the whole Story to be à shameful error, à meer dotage, or madness. First, Blundel produces à whole list of Authors living in several Nations, who all unanimously place Benedict next to Pope Leo. 2. He drawes à convincing proof from Hincmarus Bishop of Rhems, ordained Bishop. Anno 845. May the 17. Ten years before this Monster got into that See, for Ioan is supposed by those who are delighted with the Fable to have reigned. Anno 855. two whole years, five months and four dayes. So Marianus Scotus tell's his Tale. Hincmarus lived many à long year after, for he dyed 21. December. Anno 882, and Anno 866. 25. Augusti wrote to Pope Nicolas, Benedicts Successor. In these letters he tell's the Pope that some years before, he had

had sent Legats upon business to *Leo* the 4.th but saith *Hincmarus*, my Legats being advanced in their journey, understood that *Leo* was dead, notwithstanding they went on, came to Rome, and found there Pope *Benedict* to have immediately succeeded *Leo*. This Argument, saith *Blundel*, evidently demonstrates, that no Pope *Joan* intervened, or late between *Leo* and *Benedict*, unless you will phansy, that these Legats being on their way, made a halt of two whole years and 4. months, before they came to Rome, which is both improbable and ridiculous.

9. By what is said you see, that the Dr meerly cheat's when he tell's us. P. 451. that we, *The Dr's*
to cast off a matter of fact attested by much better *endeavour*
Authors than *Renalduccius*, *Prior*, and *Teremianus* Reader. *to cheat the*

(He means the story of Pope *Joan*) use only Negative Testimonies. I have now proved the Contrary and assert, that neither *Baronius* nor any other Historian makes Silence or a Negative Testimony, the best and only reproof of that fancied story. Let any at leasure peruse the excellent Writer *Florimundus Ramundus* upon this *Florimundus*
subject, calling it. The Popular error of Pope *Joan*, he will find the whole Matter not only *dus Ramundus*
most profoundly discussed, but the gross error, *dus derreyes*
made so horrid and monstrous; that Sectaries the Fable.
may blush hereafter to mention it. To what the Dr add's of better Authors, than *Renalduccius* &c. I will shew him presently he hath none comparable, or rather indeed none at all, excepting one pure *Simplician*, *Martinus Polonus*, if yet he be for it.

10. In the mean while take notice of the Dr's second fraud. *Baronius*. N. 38. now cited, where

Weighty occasions fully set down by Baronius,

The Dr Was not,

One Most remarkable,

The main Matter examined.

where he Speaks of great and most weighty occasions offered to decry this Story, fully mentions them. Photius, saith he, that false Bishop, an implacable Enemy to Popes, thrust out of his Bishoprick as one most unworthy the place, lived the whole time when *Ioan* is supposed to have been Pope, and though Photius laid to the charge of Popes many lesser matters, yet he never objected this scandalous fact against them; No more did his Patron *Michael* who then governed the Empire in the East, (though set on by Photius to revile Popes,) ever touch upon the Scandal. All this and more, which gives much force to *Baronius* his Argument drawn from Silence, our Dr silently passes over, and runs away with one piece of his Argument, peevishly concealing the best strength in it. He might also have taken notice of what followes in *Baronius*. n. 89. concerning *Leo* the 9.th who in his letter to *Michael* Bishop of Constantinople plainly tell's him of à constant naughty report Spread abroad, viz. That some Eunuchs and à woman once had been Patriarch there. And was it possible think ye, saith *Baronius*, that à most wise and prudent Pope, should make such an Objection, had the See of Rome been ever tainted with the like foul aspersions? All this our Dr, not daring to speak out, waves, and keeps close to himselfe, for fear the world should know truth.

II. Now we enter upon the main point, and will demonstrate two things. The first: that our Dr has not one Author for Pope *Ioan*, comparable to those three undervalued by him, who stand for the Translation of our Ladies Sacred

Sacred Chappel. 2. I will shew, though he had any Authors yet in his principle, they are worth nothing.

12. Concerning the first. Two Writers only are cited as the Abettors of Pope *Ioan*s fable, *Marianus Scotus*, and *Martinus Polonus*, Before these, no man ever mentioned it. But saith Baronius. N. 83. *Marianus* his own Manuscript assert's not that a woman succeeded Leo, but *Marianus Saith not absolutely* only *frigidly* relates the matter thus. *In the year that Ioan* 852, Pope Leo dyed in August, *Cui successit was Pope. Ioannes*, *qui ut asseritur fuit mulier*, whom John succeeded, who as, is said, was a woman. Then Baronius add's. As *Herold* corrupted many other things in *Marianus*, so here also he fraudulently changed the Text in the first printed Copy, calls her *Ioan*, and asseverantly saith she was a woman. Again its certain, *Marianus* err's grossly in relating Pope *Leo's* death, that lived two whole years after the Term given him by this Author. Se *Baronius*, n. 87. whence it follows, that unless *Ioan* sate Pope with *Leo*, she never was Pope. Conformable hereunto *Bell*: *Other An- thors Speak* cited above, §. *Quod autem* tell's us, that he who *Conferma- bly.* set forth the *Metropolis*, or the elaborate Church *History of Albertus Krantius* at Cologne, Anno 1584, plainly saith, that nothing is found of this *She Pope* in *Marianus* his most ancient Copies. The like *Ioannes Molanus*, a Doctor of Lovain, testifies of *Sigeberts* own Copies, or *Molanus his Testimony.* at least judged to be his, which he read in the Monastery of Gemblace where *Sigebert* was once a Monk, not a word, saith. *Molanus*, found I in it of any Pope *Ioan*.

13. *Martinus Polonus* saith *Bell*: *de Scriptis Ecclesie*

How the
Fable of
Pope Ioan,
got abroad?

The Clashing of Authors Concerning Pope Ioan, ridiculous

Eccle 2 was à simple man, and in place of true Stories feed's w with meer Fables: Neither doth he assert absolutely that *Ioan* was Pope, but only turn's you off with, à *Fertur*, its reported, and therefore relies upon an uncertain rumour. See *Bell.* cited. §. *Tertio*, and pray ye call to mind what he has more in his *Script: Ecclesi*: where he Saith, that this whole Fable of *Pope Ioan*, got out of *Polonus* his Book into the printed Copies of *Marianus* and *Sigebert*, for in their ancient Manuscripts, it is not at all. It would be here too long à work and not to my present Purpose, being only to refute the main ground our Dr stand's upon to tell you, the occasion of this Flimflam Fable (the report of à woman being à *She Patriarch* at Constantinople first set it on foot) or how those who favour it, Clash amongst themselves: Some will have her an English woman, others born at Mentz or at least educated there, others make her à Student at Athens when no learning was Professed there. Some call her *Ioan*, others *Isabel*, others *Tutta*, others *Gilberta*, and no man knowes what. More light you will have Concerning these particulars in *Baronius*, and the erudite *Florimundus* already cited.

14. I am now to make good my second Assertion against Dr Still: and to give all the fair play imaginable, let us contrary to manifest truth, suppose, that *Marianus Scotus*, *Martinus Polonus*, *Sigebert*, *Platina*, or who you will. related the story of Pope *Joan*, I Say all these Authors are no more but insignificant Cyphers in the Dr's Principles. Observe my reason. He tells us, as you have heard, that because *Dantes*,
Petrarch,

Petrarch, and *Boccace* took no notice of the Miraculous Translation of our Ladies Chappel, the wonder therefore ought in all Prudence to be held incredible. Hence I argue. But *The Dr* from the supposed reign of Pope *Ioan* to *Ma-* convinced by
rianus Scotus, *Sigebert*, and *Martinus Polonus*, his own
no Writer ever took notice of this *She Pope*. principles,
Ergo the Fable is also incredible, as will appear by an exact computation of years. Pray you observe. This *she Pope* is supposed to have reigned. Anno 855. *Marianus Scotus* was born as himselfe testifies, Anno 1028, dyed Anno 1086, and consequently lived as *Baronius* notes. n.79. at least two hundred and thirty years after Pope *Joan's* supposed reign, And what no notice taken of her all this while by any Author? Not a word by any. Here is a strange Silence. Now if we speak of *Martinus* The vast
Polonus, he lived four hundred years after, and time that
Sigebert fell not much short of him, *Sectaries* passed be-
were much later. *VVhat say we to this Silence.* tween the
Doth our *Dr*, think ye, speak at all pertinently when to undervalue the Testimonies of supposed
Teremanus, *Renalduccius*, and *Prior*, that ex- reign of Pope
pressly Say the Chappel was Miraculously trans- *Ioan* and
lated, he prefer's *Marianus Scotus*, and *Marti-* *Martinus*
Polonus (for he has no Authors more an- *Polonus*.
cient) before them, as much better witnesses? *Polonus*
Though neither dare avouch (but as you have ever cast upon any of these three Authors com- much bla-
heard faintly and without Spirit) that Pope parable to the Disgrace laid on one Polo- mished.
Ioan ever sat at Rome. What blemish was *Polonus*
ever cast upon any of these three Authors com- much bla-
parable to the Disgrace laid on one Polo- mished.
mus, judged by the wisest a wistless fellow, a
Relator of fables &c? In so much that *Brillar-*
nin,

min faith, He would not have placed him amongst the Ecclesiastical Writers, had not the *Magdeburgians* and other Hereticks cited him? Again, how enormously is our Dr out of all reasonable discourse, when he tells us, *Blondus* and other Authors cited above, came too late with their Testimonies concerning the Chappels Translation, never reflecting upon *Marianus* and *Polonus's* slowness, who followed much later with their whimsy of Pope Joan? The one as I said now, two hundred and thirty years after Her Supposed Popedom; and the other at least, four hundred. Where were the Dr's eyes in so great an Oversight? What can any man judge of him, but that he writes at random without discretion and judgement? But of *Blondus* more presently, with a word or two of the Dr's great insincerity.

The Dr's
Strange Oversight.

Four of the
Dr's Scruples,
Cleared.

15. In the mean while take notice of four simple Questions proposed by the Dr, which he call's his *Scruples*. One is; *How such a chamber should be able to hold without decay, for above a thousand and six hundred years?* I answer, we have clear Evidence of its holding out without decay in *Dalmatia* and where it now stand's, for the space well nigh of four hundred years, and therefore Say, as this latter evident Preservation is deservedly accounted *Miraculous*, so the first and longer was, though all that time it had Foundations to stand upon, and for that reason may seem less *Miraculous*. He asks 2. *How this house could possibly escape ruin when Authors say, The whole Country about Nazareth was destroyed by*

Traian

Traian after the strange devastation of it made by Vespasian. I answer. The great destruction of a whole Country necessarily implies not the Subversion of every little house in it, though it is most likely, that God by his special Providence secured the house, dear to our Blessed Lord and his sacred Mother, from the rage and fury of all those Enemies. He asks. 3. How the Church of the Annuntiation should be removed to Italy, and yet remain at Nazareth by the constant Tradition of the Eastern parts? Did ever man say and unsay like this Dr? Just now he will have the house destroyed in the general devastation of a whole Country, and here the constant Tradition of the Eastern parts, makes it still to remain at Nazareth. If it remain still at Nazareth: it was not destroyed, or if destroyed, it remain's not still there. Again, if it stand there still, the Dr must solve his first difficulty of its not desaying, for above Sixteen Ages. What Sence or coherence have we in this mans writing? But of this egregious Cheat more presently.

16. He asks, 4. How the measure should be found exactly agreeing by those sent to examine it, when Thomas de Novaria saith, that he lately found out the only true foundations larger than the Angels Chappel there built? And he places Thomas de Novaria in his Context with a blind marginal Note. Quaresm: (abbreviated) Elucid: terra Sancta Lib. 7 c. 5. Whereas, Franciscus Quaresmius should have been cited as the Principle Author, and Thomas à Novaria brought in as a witness by Quaresmius, for so he is. But the Dr thought

The sacred Chappel preserved by divine Providence.

The Dr agrees not with himselfe.

His odd way in quoting Quaresmius.

it best to cast à mist before the eyes of à vulgar Reader for fear of having his notorious fraud discovered, which I will now lay open.

The relation
made by
Quares-
mius,

Taken from
Thomas à
Novaria.

17. *Quaresmius*, Tom. 2. *Elucidat: terra Sancta. lib. 7. cap. 5. Peregr. 3. page 837.* set's down the long relation of *Thomas à Novaria*, where wee are told first, what difficulties both he and his companion. *P. F. Iacobus* encountered in their Pilgrimage to *Nazareth*, yet by God's good assistance overcame all. Then, p. 8:8. *Colum. 2. paulo post medium*, has these words. *Locum igitur Sanctum ingressi &c.* We entered into the holy place at *Nazareth*, on whose foundations the house of *Loreto* once stood, and being led into the dark Cave where the Sacred Virgin was saluted by the Angel, we reverently adored there, and soon after began to cleanse the holy Sanctuary, and blessed that old Altar of the Annuntiation which the long-since living Christians had erected. Much more followes of great Miracles wrought in that place, and of two Pillars set up by the ancient Christians, as à Memorial of the Angels Saluting our Lady &c. This is all *Thomas à Novaria* hath to our p'sent purpose in *Quaresmius* his 5. Chapter, whereunto the Dr remits us, and you see its granted, that the Chappel had stood there without mentioning its being now at *Nazareth*, neither have you any word of those larger foundations in that Chapter, whereof the Dr speak's. Now if he say, our Ladies house stood indeed once at *Nazareth*, but afterward was destroyed; turn to the foregoing. 4th. Chapter in *Quaresmius*, and you will find the Dr's whole fraud, or malice rather

ther unmasked, by his own quoted Author Thomas à Novaria, an Eye-witness of the Evidence.

18. For the better understanding of the whole Story, and the Dr's juggling, please to note with *Quaresmius*. §. *Tertio*. That *Iacobus à Vandosma*, a man most industrious and accurate, gives assurance, that in the place at Nazareth (from whence the house of Loreto was carried away) another little Church, called the Chappel of the Angel, or the Church of the Annuntiation, was built, not just equal to the old foundations of our Ladies Chamber, but lower, upon the Floor, or Pavement, and in a straiter Compass. Wherefore, saith he, the Chamber next to the dark cave being taken away by the Ministry of Angels, in place of it, this other Chappel was erected, having some addition of polisht stones laid by the inward foundations of the house of Loreto, to support better the whole fabrick of the Angels Chappel, and this the ancient Christians adjoyned. Now, saith Novaria, we (*Viz.* Himselfe and *Iacobus à vandosma*) meddled not with the inward enlargement, but beginning from the old and true foundations of our ladies Chamber, drew a right line, measured them exactly, and found to our great Joy this place in Nazareth, *per omnia*, every way just equal to the foot of the foundations of the Holy house at Loreto. All things perfectly answer one another, all things exactly agree between this Chappel at Nazareth, and the holy house at Loreto. Dempto quod dixi: excepting what I noted of the inward enlargement, whereby the Angels

The Church of the Annuntiation erected, in the place, where the house of Loreto once stood.

The measure of the old foundations taken, exactly agrees to.

Chappel, drawn in à little, is not fully so large as the foundations of the house of Loreto are. These truths saith Novaria we publish upon our certain knowledge, for the comfort of all faithful People to the end, that no man may hereafter doubt in à matter of so great Concern.

*Novaria
and Vando-
ma frankly
acknowledge
the Transla-
tion of the
Chappel,*

19. Reflect, courteous Reader in passing, before we return to the Dr, how earnestly would Novaria and Vando^{ma} have stood for the still quiet owning, so great à treasure as the Sacred house of Loreto is (till now,) could they have done it in justice or conscience? How eagerly would they have pleaded. *Olim possideo, Prior possideo.* We here at Nazareth, not you at Loreto, preserve yet in being the Sacred Chamber, where the Angel saluted the Virgin, and God ^{became} was man; had either Tradition, or any Authority boy'd them up, or patronized their cause? But no such Opposition was made. No. They contented themselves with the *Angels Chappel*, which they had under their charge. Anno 1626. and convinced by Evidence, frankly acknowledged the Translation of the house to Loreto to be most true, and so likewise doth the whole Church of God, (witness *Quaresmius*. C. 4. *fine*) Popes, saith he, have granted great Indulgences and Priviledges to the Holy house of Loreto, the frequent Concourse of People still honour it, God most certainly hath wrought great Miracles there, and done the like even in this at Nazareth. And though, saith he, the Translation of the house of Loreto may in some things seem contrary to Sense which is fallacious, yet Sense

*So likewise
doth quares-
mius*

Part. 2. c. 4. More VVitnesses Produced, 65
 of lesse value, ought to be postponed, and all due
 respect given to the judgement of the most wise, *The Trans*
 who never called the *Miraculous Translation* into *Batson* never
 Question. Among these wise he numbers at *called into*
 the beginning of his. 4.th Chapter, *Canisius*, *question*
Mantuanus and stiles him *Laudatissimum Theolo-*
gum, à worthy Divine, *Hieronymus Angelita*, *More Au*
 Secretary to the Common wealth of Recanati, *thors quoted*
 à most diligent and sincere man, witness his
 whole book of the house of Loreto. *Baronius*,
Rutilius, *Benzonius*, and finally *Franciscus Alcarotus*
 in *Itinerario terra Sancta*, besides many more,
 cited by these Authors.

20. By all now said, you see the Dr's fraudu- *The Dr's*
 lent and unjust Proceeding, when he asks. *fraud disco-*
vered
How the Church of the annuntiation at Nazareth
should be removed to Italy, and yet remain still at
Nazareth by the constant Tradition of the Eastern
parts? Has this man any Conscience think ye,
 when upon à *meer cheat* he would perswade the
 Reader, that our Ladies Chappel *was never*
translated to Italy, and to his eternal discredit,
 ground's the *Cheat upon à gross error*, in not
 distinguishing between *the Church of the An-*
nuntiation, and the *translated Chappel?* To take *where his*
cheat lies?
 away all shift and evasion. He either makes
 the Church of *the Annuntiation* one and the same
 with the *Chappel of Loreto*, or different? If the
 Same; All Authors, as you have heard, flatly
 contradict him, and there is no Tradition con-
 stant or unconstant for *that*. If, which is most
 true, they are distinct Chappels, his Question is
 no less fraudulent than impertinent, for suppose
 à distinction of these two Chappels, the one
 may well remain at Nazareth, *as it doth*, and

The Dr
clearly con-
vinced,

Another
cheat concer-
ning the
Commensu-
ration made,
cleared by
Novaria.

yet no way clash with the Translation of the other to Loreto, as we have amply proved already. Be it how you will, the Dr is Shamefully out, for if our Ladies Cell where she was Saluted by the Angel be at Loreto, we have our intent: and if it still remaine at Nazareth, the Dr's Scruples of an old house lasting so long without decay, and escaping ruin in the General devastation made by Vespasian, are senseless and signify nothing, but thus much only, that the Dr writes he knowes not what.

21. The second Cheat concern's the commensuration made between the Angels Chappel, and the ancient foundations of our Ladies Chamber found larger, saith the Dr, than the Angels Chappel. We ask here for a further discovery of his fraud, what he mean's by the Angels Chappel? If he Speak of the house of Loreto (and this he must mean or nothing) his error is intolerable, as is now made out. In case he would only Say, that the old foundations of our Ladies Chappel are larger than the Angels Chappel built upon them, Thomas à Novaria hath given a full account thereof, and told you, that the Angels Chappel *drawn in a little* by reason of an addition laid to the old foundations of our Ladies translated house, *Non adequatur* (to use his words) answer's not exactly, and this makes not at all for the Dr's purpose, yet clearly laies open his malice or ignorance, if not both together.

22. Ponder now, courteous Reader on the one side the proofs produced for the Miraculous Translation of the Sacred house of Loreto; weigh well on the other, how pittifully
the

the Dr fumbles, while he impugn's it. You have not from him so much as one Argument (excepting à few Negatives) brought against it. You have not one Author alledged, that call's the Miracle into doubt, and though here-
after he quotes some Catholick writers, that in his eyes seem to question *such and such à Story*, yet in his handling the present Relation of Loreto, he is wholly silent, and gives you none, but himselfe, calling it an *incredible fiction*.
 Ponder I say these things well, and you will see how powerfully truth outfaces falshood, and must conclude, with *Petra Sancta*. P. 39. *Those seem not men in their Wits, that boggle at so clear à Miracle?* What saith this Author? Will these Hereticks upon the Authority of *Pliny. Lib. 2. C. 8.* believe by humane faith, that two Mountains neer *Modena* rose up, violently justled one another, and again returned to their old Postures? Can they believe, because Authors say it, that some Cities in Syria seated upon Mountains were thrown six miles off into à Plain and there remain'd entire without dammage, and here doubt whether God can remove à little house from place to place? In doing so, they must either Question his *Omnipotency* and this is madness, or scruple the *fidelity of Authors* already produced, which are not inferiour, but far more Credible, than either *Pliny*, or *Theophrastus*.

Arguments alledged for the Chappels Translation, clear, and urgent.

Against the Dr let's flie à few jeers and dissatisfactory Negatives.

What wonders Hergistics own upon humane Faith.

C H A P. V.

*The Dr's Frivolous Objections against
the Miracles wrought at Loreto,
dissolved. A word of his
other frauds.*

OUR SA-
VIOUR'S OWN
Miracles,
Manifest at
Loreto.

1. **T**O insist in this place upon the evident known Miracles wrought by the Intercession of the Blessed Virgin at Loreto, or to mention the Donaries offered there as *Testimonies of gratitude*, would be only à Transcription of what Turfelin, and other writers have amply performed to my hands. In à word. Our Saviours own Miracles (*The blind see, the lame walk, men possessed with Devils, free'd &c.*) have been manifestly done at Loreto. To relate all or halfe, would require à Volume. I must therefore wave them, and remit you to *Turfelin* for further Satisfaction, my task being only to encounter the Dr's more than Childish Caviles against some few, he quarrels with. One related by *Turfelin. lib. 2. c. 18.* is briefly thus.

2. A certain Priest of Dalmatia taken by the Turks was urged to renounce his Religion, but would not, still calling upon *Christ* and the *Sacred Virgin*, whereupon the barbarous Turks threatned to pull out his bowels if he did not curse them both, which by no threats he would do, but contrarywise made à vow to *our Lady* at Loreto, that if he lived he would goe thither in Pilgrimage. In à word, they open'd his brest, pulled

pulled out his Entrails, put them into his hands and bid him be gone. The Priest went away, and after many daies journey came to Loreto, shewed there *his open brest and entrails* in his hands to the Officers of the Chappel, gave thanks to the Virgin Mother, made his confession, received the Blessed Sacrament, and dyed there. The Entrails were hung up in the Chappel till they were nigh consumed. You may see the rest of the Story in Turfellin, now cited. *is not this à Swinging Miracle, saith our Dr?* Pray you mark what à Swinging answer he return's to it. To ask, saith he, how à man can breath without his lungs, or live without à heart, or by what vessels the Circulation of blood was performed, were but to gratify Carnal reason too much, and he saies well, for just so an Atheist to gratify Carnal reason, might propose as wise à Question, and ask. How Moses. Exod. 3. Saw à bush burn without being consumed, for this as much transcend's the force of Nature, as to se à man breath without his lungs, therefore faith is required, *Humane faith in one case, Divine in the other.* Marry, saith the Dr (and here is his swinging reply) *men must certainly have great store of faith, or folly rather and impudence, that dare call these Legends by the name of Authentick Testimonies.* Is not this, think ye, à profound refutation of à Testimony so evident, that Turfellin hold's it à sin to doubt of it. I say Evident, all circumstances considered, however be it less, the Dr's answer is childish, which amount's to this. He either will not, or cannot believe the Story, Ergo it is false? After this strain, should an Atheist say. I neither will

A Miracle wrought upon à Priest of Dalmatia.

A visible proof of the Miracle.

The Dr's simple Ex- caption a- gainst it.

The Dr and Atheists argue alike.

will nor can believe the Miracles in Scripture, he would prove as well (that's nothing at all) those Miracles to be false, as the Dr^t doth this, for all he brings against it, is only his *own bare and blunt denial*, and cannot an Atheist be as blunt as he? O! but Scripture Miracles are better grounded. What then? That help's not the Dr^t at all, for here we parallel not the certainty of Scripture Miracles considered *in themselves*, with others believed upon Humane faith, but compare *this Dr's simple Impugnation* with *that of Atheists*, and say they are both alike, ridiculous, foolish, and weightless.

*What it is,
we impugn
in the Dr.*

3. The Dr^t goes on. *There are very few Persons in the World but at some time or other of their lives, do meet with extraordinary deliverances, either from diseases, or other dangers. If any of these had gone to Loreto, and there acquainted the Penitentiary with it, it had been entered into the Tables and preserved (as à Tooth-drawer doth teeth) for the reputation of the place. I set down these ungodly words, to shew you the virulent humour of this man, who in stead of proving, rail's, and Calumniat's, for its well known that no Miracles enter the Tables at Loreto, or any other holy place, but such only as after most rigid examination are prudently judged, not casual deliverances, but works above the force of nature. Read Tursellin lib. 3. c. 25. and see how Miraculously à young woman of Sienna, stark blinde, and wholly despaired of by Physicians, recovered her perfect sight in the Presence of many, while she devoutly prayed to our Lady in the Chappel of Loreto. Raphael Riera set's down the Miracle, and saies he was present*

A flat Calumny.

present when God did the wonder. Can this, which most deservedly entred the publick Tables, be called one of the Dr's extraordinary Deliverances? If so, why was not the blinde Mans cure wrought by our Saviour. *John the 9.* Undervalued by the Jewes, and thought only an extraordinary Deliverance, but no Miracle, because the Spirit of Atheism will have it so. *Was the blinde Mans Cure in the Gospel accounted only an extraordinary Deliverance?*

4. In the next place our Dr fiercely opposes the Miracle wrought upon Pope Pius the second, an old man broken with Labours, and besides, much afflicted with à dangerous Cough, and à burning Feaver. The good Pope as *Tursellin* relates. *Lib. I. c. 26.* having offered his Gift of à weighty golden Chalice to our Lady at Loreto, and made à Vow to visit the place, implored by earnest prayer, the blessed Virgins favour for his *speedy recovery*. No sooner had he done so, saith *Tursellin*, but his Feaver in à moment went off, the troublesome cough left him, his weak and feeble limbs worn away with à long Infirmary regained Strength, and this very suddenly. Pius therefore willing to comply with his vow, undertook his journey towards *Ancona*, and *Loreto*, and the neerer he drew to *Loreto*, the better he found himselfe in health, being there strong and well able, he performed his promise. and from thence went to *Ancona*, where (old as he was) he stayed in the Summer-heats expecting the Commander of the Venetian Navy, but at last wearied out with delay and age together, relapsed into his Feaver, and there dyed. Here our Dr begins to flutter. Call you this à Miracle? I know not, saith he, what kind of Miracles the Lady of Loreto works, I am sure

The Miracle wrought upon Pope Pius.

The Pope suddenly Cured.

*The like
Miracle
wrought by
our Saviour.*

*How the
Dr Cheat's.*

*The Cheat
made mani-
fest by two
Instances.*

sure Christ and his Apostles never wrought such. You erre grossly Mr Dr, Christ our Lord, Luke the. 4. 38. Presently cured simons wives Mother sick of à burning Feaver, who Presently arose and ministred to them. And thus Pope Pius, forthwith, in à moment recovered health. But saith the Dr. *Away the Pope goes for Ancona and there dies of his feaver, and is dying of à disease à Miraculous Cure?* Here he cheat's egregiously, because à very considerable time passed between the Popes recovery and his death, as is clearly gathered from *Turfellins* whole Naration, therefore, unless the Dr would have an old decayed man to live alwaies, I know not what he would say. Again, suppose that an accident caused by the heats at *Ancona*, and à wearisom expecting Souldiers there had taken away the Popes life sooner, can this impair the *clear evidence of the Miracle done?* Pray you imagin, that some extraordinary heat had bereaved *Lazarus* of life à whole Month after he rose from the dead, or, that one by chance had put out the eyes of the blinde Man, cured by our Saviour; would either the one or the other *Cross Casualty* have made Christ's Miracles lesse famous, void, or uneffectual? Yet thus the Dr discourfes while he saies à *Miracle is à perfect Work, and that dying of à disease is not Miraculous*, never reflecting on the respite of time, or the unexpected Accident which intervned between the Popes cure, and his death. These circumstances (and it was for the Dr's purpose to embellish the cheat) he silently passes over, and too nimblely tell's us. *Away the Pope goes for Ancona, and there dies of his Feaver.*

5. The Dr having done with Pope Pius,
unluc-

unluckily fall's into another foul errour, and wrong's *Turfellin* very much. *Turfellin* Lib: I. c. 26. Gives three reasons why *S. Vincentius*, *S. Antonin*, and the ancient Italian Writers omitted to mention the Chappels Translation. First, *S. Vincentius* lived in Spain the time of à troublesome Schism, what wonder therefore if the rumour of the Translation got not thither? 2. *S. Antonin* and the other more ancient Historians had their Country entangled in à fearful Civil war, which might well obstruct the certain knowledge of it, as to them. 3. Saith *Turfellin*, none perhaps of the ancient writers mentioned the Translation, because as yet it was not approved, or confirmed by the Popes Authority. The wonder therefore of à house carried from one Part of the world to another being so uncouth and strange, they prudently waved it, least they should seem to utter vain and incredible things. But *Blondus* notwithstanding, almost as ancient à VWriter as *S. Vincent* and *S. Antonin*, and one that alwaies waited on the Pope, gave as you have heard above, an Excellent Testimony, and asserts the Miracle as most undoubted. It is true; before the wonderful cure wrought upon *Pope Pius*, the House had not the renown, which it gained afterward by that illustrious Miracle the whole world over. This is briefly the substance of what *Turfellin* hath.

The reasons
alleged by
Turfellin,
why some
Authors
omitted to
mention the
Translation.

Blondus pro-
duced by
Turfellin;

6. Now mark how fraudulently the D^r deal's with him, First, he wholly waves the main reasons alleged by *Turfellin* concerning the Silence of the Italian Writers and then seek's advantage from the little fame *Loreto* had, before

*The Dr waves Turf-
ellin's main
reasons.*

fore the Miracle wrought upon Pope Pius, which, saith he, is the reason Turfellin gives, why Vincentius, Antoninus, and the other Italian Writers take no notice of it. It may passe for one reason, Mr Dr, but neither is it the only, or the Chiefest; for the difficulty of Schism respectively to Spain, the Intestine war raised in Italy, and the want of approbation from the See Apostolick in those dayes, are Turfellin's main grounds, all waved by you. Yet worse followes. Those, saith the Dr, who did take notice of it as Blondus, yet doe not mention the Translation, least they should seem to utter vain and incredible things. A very Substantial reason I confess. Thus the Dr. A very Cheat say I. Reflect Reader, would not any man who reads these lines in the Dr, take it for granted, that Blondus with others omitted to mention the Chappels Translation, for fear of publishing vain and incredible things? Yet Turfellins words beare à quite contrary Sence, and relate not at all to Blondus, but oppose his Testimony, plainly speaking of the Miraculous house, to the Silence of ancient Authors, that said nothing of it, for the reasons already mentioned. Turfellins words are these. *At Blondus illorum fere aqualis &c.* But Blondus almost equal to the other gave an illustrious Testimony of it. Now our Dr pervert's the whole Sence in making the word *At*, or *but*, in this place to signify, *As*. Read Turfellin, and the Dr's fraud will manifestly appear. Perhaps He may say Blondus in expresse terms speak's not of the Chappels Translation, least he should seem to utter an incredible thing. Suppose this were in it selfe true,

*The Dr forces upon
Turfellins
words, à
Sence quite
contrary to
his meaning.*

as it is most false, the Dr yet cannot by this Shift clear himselfe from jugling, or ever make it out that *Blondus* Said so.

7. What followes next in the Dr, is nothing but Raillery or rather à whole List of unproved Calumnies told one after another, as of *Miracles growing very frequent, of Peoples Superstition and Credulity, of the abuse of Priests, who make their Tables by the confident affirmation of persons that tell Stories of Miracles.* And thus in all likelihood, saith the Dr, *Riera* the Pœnitentiary was abused. *Raillery and Calumnies.*

8. In passing take notice of his childish Proof. In all likelihood. So in all likelihood the Jew, whom our Blessed Lady freed out of Prison was à forged tale. *Turfellin* relates the true Story. Lib: 4. c. 12. and therefore I wave it. But no doubt, saith the Dr, the Venetian Courtesan was à person of great credit, who having spent many year's in that trade, came to Loreto full of à strange Miracle. The Dr scornfully derides this poor Penitent's afflicted condition, but *Turfellin* lib: 3. c. 27 if you attend to all circumstances, makes it undoubted. *The Dr derides the sad Condition of à poor afflicted Penitent.*

9. Briefly. The young woman born in Sicily, led it's true, à lewd life at Venice, but weary of it, at last became very pœnitent, and turned what she had into Jewels and ready money with intention to see her own Country again, yet in the way purposed to visit Loreto there to bewail her whole life, and to make à general Confession. She took with her for à Guide one thought trusty, but it proved otherwise, for the perfidious Man when they came to the wood of *Ravenna* rob'd her of all the wealth *The Story of this young woman, briefly related.*

*How she
was wound-
ed by à
perfidious
Guide.*

*And mira-
culously
cured.*

*The Marks
of her
wounds, and
innocent life,
proofs of the
Miracle.*

wealth she had, cut her throat, desperately wound-
ed her, ran away, and left the poor Creature
desolate Swimming in her own blood. In
this sad condition she often implored the help
of the Blessed Virgin, who presently appear-
ing, cured her wounds, and filled her Soul
with heavenly comfort. Now while she was
devoutly on her knees giving thanks to Al-
mighty God, and singing praises to the blessed
Virgin for the cure wrought on her mangled
body, Providence so ordered that some Mu-
lletts passed by, who finding her all bloody
in her undermost linnen wear (all the Rogue
had left her) cast upon the halfe naked creature
à course Coverlet, set her on à Mule, and
carried her to Ancona, where she begg'd some
poor cloaths and from thence went joyfully to
Loreto. Comming thither, She first confes-
sed and complied with her vow, then made à
relation of the whole danger past, and gained
credit by shewing the marks of her wounds,
chiefly that about her neck, like à Jewell or shin-
ning Neclace. 2. by her virtuous and devout life
at Loreto, for she prefer'd that holy Place be-
fore her own Country and lived there many
year's, exciting others by her Innocent and
most laudable example to Piety, and devotion.
The rest you have in Twissellin:

10. The Dr goes about to refute this Story
by proposing à ridiculous Question. Was not,
saith he, the Blessed virgin very kind to à Cour-
tesan? He might with the like ungodly Spirit
have propos'd as wise à Question, and ask'd
whether our Saviour was not as kind to the
woman taken in Adultery. John. 8. 3. to whom
he

he said, *Goe and sin no more?* And this very effect of *sinning no more* after our Lady had wrought the Cure, really shewed it selfe in this pœnitent Convertite, who lived ever after innocently, and free from all blemish of impurity.

A Serious answer, to the Dr's ungracious leer.

What followes in the Dr is not worth refuting. First, he excepts against the single Testimony of this woman, insufficient to make the Miracle credible, whereas Tursellin gives for further Proofs the marks of her wounds which *could not be feigned*, and her virtuous innocent life perseverantly held on without change, to her dying day. These are pregnant Circumstances. Yet is it not possible, saith our Dr, to suppose that the Priests for the reputation of their house, may help out à lame Miracle with an advantageous Circumstance or two? Dr look to it. Far sweeter and more advantageous Circumstances have drawn you to Cheat the world as you have done, not by relating Miracles (for you have none) but by writing manifest untruths laid open before your eyes. These Priests (hitherto of unstained Credit) you could never yet tax of one falshood, but by unproved Suppositions, which overthrow all the Miracles in Scripture. Come close if you dare to the point, and shew me but one lame Miracle recorded by these Priests, and in lieu of that, I do hereby engage to demonstrate no lame but twenty swinging, gross, and palpable untruth's in your Books. Is not this plain dealing?

How the Dr argues by unproved Suppositions.

II. Much worse followes in our Dr, who after à long tattle of rich Jewels and silver Shrines presented to our Ladies Chappel, talk's of vast endowments which may tempt men to

A fair Offer made to the Dr.

78 Part 2. c. 5. Miracles at Loreto,
strain à little in such trifles as à few circumstances are.
 I answer, it is very true, that S. Andrewes
 Church in Holborn is not so enriched with Je-
 wels, Chalices, or shrines as our Ladies at Lo-
 reto, but, Sr, know, these are immoveable
 treasures belonging to the *sacred house* no wayes
 appropriable or beneficial to *particular Priests*,
more than to look on them. Concerning the
 Cavil of vast endowments, I dare boldly
 avouch, that D^r Still: drawes vaster Incomes
 from his Cure and *Prebendship*, than any three
 Priests get to themselves at Loreto. And may
 not such Revenues think ye tempt the D^r to
 strain far, and help him on, to publish the
 open untruths found in his writings, when to
 use his own words, *there is such à reward for lying?*
 Believe it men need not to propose *Cassius* his
 Question, *Cui bono.* For the D^r will tell you,
 he has got well by *his Trade.* If he be not à
 loser at last, he has better luck than many
 à poor Priest, at Loreto.

His Cavil
 of vast
 endowments,
 refuted.

The Dr
 iustly bla-
 meable in
 what he
 wrongfully
 accuses
 or says.

12. Having thus briefly shewed the Dr
 justly blameable in that he wrongfully accuses
 others, I am, as I said, in the next place after
 his talk of Shrines and Jewels to contest à little
 with him about his bitter *Invectives* against
Tables hanging upon Walls, wherein Miraculous
 Cures are expressed to the end, Pilgrims may be
 better informed of Gods wonderful works
 done by the *Intercession* of our *blest Lady*, and
 other Saints, now happy in Heaven. Can
 any one *Imagin*, saith he, if all the *Miracles* of
Christ and his *Apostles* had been done in this manner,
 and the *Testimony* of them only taken from *Tables*
hanging upon Walls, that ever Christianity would
 have

have prevailed upon the Ingenuous part of Mankind? I stand amazed at the strange procedure of this exasperated man. What can he mean by these empty words. If the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles had been done in this manner. The manner is clear, Christ's Miracles were first really wrought, take for an Instance the raising of Lazarus from the dead, and tell me, if either of his Sisters, Mary or Martha, had written the whole Story in à Table, and hanged it upon à wall in their Castle, whether that would have prejudiced in the least our Saviours Miracle, or proved an offence to any? No certainly. Our offence is no more, We prove Miracles to have been truly wrought at Loreto (first seen by Ey-witnesses) and to preserve à memory of them some (after rigid examination, and approbation given by the Prelat's of the Church) are appointed to express the work's of God in Tables: It is hard to find any thing amiss here. Unless the Dr will have all Tables Cashier'd and be angry with God, for writing the ten Commandements in Tables of Stone, or rail at Moses who coming from the Mountain. Exod. 31. 15. carried the two Tables of the Testimony in his hands written on both Sides. There is yet more of this weightless stuff. The Miracles of Christ and his Apostles, saith the Dr, were not taken from any Tables hanging upon Walls, but were wrought in the view of his Enemies &c. I answer, neither is the Original Testimony of Miracles done at Loreto, taken from any written Tables; these serve only for à Memorial of what God hath done, the primary Evidence is taken from

His simple
exception
against Ta-
bles hanging
on walls,

Retorted,
and shew'd
à trifling
toy.

What Ta-
bles serve
for?

*Tables give
not the first
Evidence of
Miracles.*

those Ey-witnesses (long since perhaps dead and gone) who saw them wrought. And must not all discourse thus of the Miracles related in Scripture? Scripture 'tis well known, gives no Evidence of its own Miracles, but *supposes them truly done*, and makes them to us matters of Divine Faith: So these Tables lay not before you the Primary Evidence of the Miracles there related, (for that is truly supposed) but make *them credible upon humane faith*.

*An other
cheat refuted*

*Miracles
publicly
wrought in
the Church.*

13. To the Dr's second Cavil of Christ's Miracles being *publicly wrought* in the sight of enemies, I may well say, *thanks be to God, that our Saviour has now more friends, than he had at his first preaching to the world*. Believe it, Miracles wrought in the Church evidently seen by both friends and Enemies, *have gained many*, Witness that strange wonder done at Zaragosa in Spain, of S. Januaries blood *boiling up*, and the *Evident cure* wrought upon John Clement. Now if any of these prodigious things contrary to the common course of nature, had been written in publick Tables, as they are yet *preserved upon Record*, would, that think ye, have impaired their Credit or made them *lesse Miraculous*? It is à plain degree of madness to Judge So.

*The Apostles
received
presents.*

14. We have in the next place à Swinging Objection. They, saith the Dr, *who attested the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles did not sit to receive Presents, or to tell tales*, as he thinks those at Loreto do. One word, M^r Dr. We read. *Act. 4. 35.* That after the Apostles had given Testimony of our Saviours *Miraculous Resurrection*, very many sold what they had, and

and laid all down at the Apostles feet, so *Ioseph*, called *Barnabas* sold a piece of land, and brought the money to the Apostles. Did not those blessed men receive *Presents for pious uses*? Please now to Consider. All that belongs to the house of Loreto, is either reduced to the *temporal means* given by Pious Christians for the necessary maintainance of those who serve the Chappel, and *do you not know* saith the Apostle. 1. Cor. 9. 13. *That they who minister in the Holy place, eat the things that are of the holy place: and they that serve the Altar participate with the Altar &c.* Now if Dr Still: except against such Donations, he is to quit the Rents of S. Andrew and his *Prebendship* too, for these Originally came from the charitable Liberality of the like devout Christians, who cast *their wealth at the Apostles feet*, though (God knowes) they never intended that such men as the Dr is, should enjoy them. Or. 2. *both laudable.* He Cavils at the Donaries presented to our Lady at Loreto, and these, whether votive Oblations for the attaining favours, confidently hoped; or grateful acknowledgements of favours received, though they add nothing to the Priests Temporals, yet are praise worthy and approved by Antiquity. Read the ancient and Learned *Theodoret. Tom. 4. Paris print. 1642 Sermo: 8. de Martyribus p. 605*, where speaking of the glorious, and well adorned Temples of the Martyrs, he saith. *I, and others often meet there together, and we sing praises to Almighty God. Those that enjoy perfect health beg a continuance of it, the infirm or diseased sue by their prayers for health.* Women barren, petition

Donaries offer'd at Loreto, of two Sorts,

and approved by Antiquity, with the Theodoret.

82 Part 2. c. 5. Miracles at Loretto,
 to become Mothers, and when their request is
 granted, they pray that the Children may be pre-
 served from danger, yet we goe not to these Mar-
 tyrs as Gods, but pray to them as Intercessors &c.
 But how doth Theoderet show that those who
 ask with Faith and confidence, obtain what
 they petition for? He answers. ἀναφανδὸν
 μαρτυρεῖ τὰ τέτων ἀναθήματα τὴν ἰατρειὰν
 δηλοῦν &c. The Donaries offered by good
 People openly witness that many have been cu-
 red, whereof some hang up little pictures of Eyes,
 others of feet, others of hands, made of gold
 and silver, and these Images presented by such
 as have recovered health, though little, are
 acceptable to God, and testimonies of the
 favours received. Now if larger gifts have
 been offered at Loreto, they yet come short
 of the Primitive Christians Zeal, who laid
 down all they had before the Apostles feet.

*Little ima-
 ges of feet
 and hands,
 offer'd in the
 Temples of
 Martyrs.*

15. Our Dr. P. 461. Still vexed at the
 hanging up of Tables, tell's us, it is à practise
 taken from Heathens, among whom nothing
 was more usual, than to set up votive Tables
 in the Temples of their Gods. I answer.
 If the Dr will have the Tables at Loreto taken
 down, because it Seem's à Heathenish custome
 to keep them there, He ought to pull down
 S. Andrewes Church in Holborn, and publick-
 ly dissuade the whole Nation from building
 any more Steeple houses, for fear of doing
 what the Heathens did. Here, Sr, is the
 whole force of your Argument (which to me
 appears nonsense) Se how it run's without
 legs. Christians in somethings do, and ever will
 do,

*Aridulous
 Objection.*

do, as the Heathens did, That is, they eate, drink, and sleep, they make Churches and frequent them, they hang up their Tables (I have seen some in Canterbury Church) as you not long Since hung up the Table of the Ten Commandements in your Churches. Ergo, *Heathens both you and we are Heathens, and with as good Logick proved Geese, because à Goos goes upon two legs, and so do all men, whether Heathens, or not. It is your very Argument easily put in form, Mr Dr. O! but the Heathens set up their votive Tables in the Temples of those Gods they were addicted to, some to Neptune in case of escape from Shipwreck, others to Isis and Æsculapius in case of recovery from dangerous diseases, and the same custome saith Lambin upon Horace, continues still, only in stead of the Heathen Gods, we do it to the Virgin Mary, or some Saint. And is not this à vast disparity? Observe well. The Heathens make their votive Tables or prayed to wicked dead wretches, whom they falsely called Gods. We pray to the Blessed Virgin most certainly in Heaven, and likewise to other Saints now glorious in Blisse, and say they are not the supream God, but Creatures made by his Omnipotent power. Ergo (and mark the nonsense, or dull Consequence) we do as Pagans doe, though most opposit to them in our Proceeding.*

A vast disparity between the practise of Heathens and Catholicks.

16. It is here needlets to insist longer upon this particular, seeing Dr. T. G. in his late learned Treatise. *Catholicks no Idolaters.* Part. 3. c. 1. hath stoutly foyled the Dr. and given à plain disparity between Catholicks honour

Laid out la-
sely by à
Worthy Do-
ctor.

relating to Saints, and the Heathens worship towards their Inferiour Deities. All I am to take notice of in this place, is the impertinent simplicity of Dr Still. Who brings in à whole drove of Poets, *Virgil, Ovid, Tibullus* &c. Mentioning what *Lambin* upon Horace had observed. But to what purpose, unless it be to show his skill in Poetry. I cannot Imagin, yet well remember, that when *Baptista Mantuanus*, an excellent Poet, à Christian, à good Divine, and à Religious Man, was cited above to authorise the Translation of our Ladies Chappel, the Dr discarded him with à flurt of his finger. No wonder, saith he, if *Mantuan* found the story fit for à Poets brain to work upon. And here, Heathens, and prophane Poets, are with great gravity Vbered in, to Countenance *Lambins* loudly: Viz. That we honour the Blessed Virgin just as the Heathens did their false supposed Gods. In this occasion it seems the Poets brains were sanctified, and had very fit matter to work upon.

Dr Stillings-
fleets un-
worthy Pro-
ceeding.

A vain
Fable related
by the Dr
of Isis.

17 A main Objection remain's yet untou-
ched, and is taken from à remarkable Testimony
of *Diodorus Siculus* given of Isis in Egypt. *Biblioth.
Histor. Lib. 1. p. 22.* *Thu Isis had great skill in Phy-
sick, and being advanced to Immortality took great
content in the cure of men, to whom she often appea-
red in their sleep, (as saith the Dr, it is in very many
of those of Loreto) and shewed great readines to
help them, The evidence whereof, is not taken from
the Fables of the Greeks, but is proved by matter of
fact, for the whole World bears witness to it, by the
honour given her. In à word she cured many given
over by Physicians, the blind and lame have been
healed*

healed by her, and which is more, saith Diodorus (the Dr wisely leaves it out) this Goddess invented à strange Medicine able to make men immortal, nay, she restored life to dead Horus, the last King of Egypt, and if you desire to hear what Isis said of herselfe, turn to the next Page in Diodorus. I, said she, am Queen of this whole Country. The law established by me no man shall break. All à long I am the Eldest daughter of the great God Saturn. I Desage and am both Wife and daughter to King Osiris. I am she Madnesse. that first invented all kind of grain and Corn. I am she that dayly rises in the Dog-star. These Fopperies and à hundred more you have related of à Heathen, and written by à Heathen, our wise Dr tells gravely, as à remarkable Story against the honour given to our Blessed Lady, and bid's. E. W. Produce more Authentick Stories than these are.

18. What can the Dr drive at think ye? Will he periwade the Reader that Isis (the like is of Ceres and the Statue of Hercules cited afterward) in real truth wrought such Miracles? Did she who believed not in one true God, effectually raise the dead to life? Did She restore sight to the blind, and health to the lame? Grant this, The Dr highly disparages our Saviours own Miracles and takes from them life and Vigour, in à word all Credibility. Observe my reason. Had the Dr been present when Christ raised Lazarus to life, or cured the blind man in the Gospel, might he not have slighted those wonders, and said that the Goddess Isis had done as much as these came to, for she restored life to King Horus à long time dead, as the Egyptians recount

How the Dr
is urged, if
he own the
so pretended
Heathenish
Miracles,
true.

*The Doctrin
of Christ,
and Iſis,
quite Con-
trary.*

recount upon undeniable Authentick Testimonies faith the Dr. She also cured many blind and lame, if therefore her Miracles are true, might not the Dr have Said, yours, o Lord signify nothing to me, while you preach à quite Contrary Doctrin to Iſis and confirm it, as you tell us in the Gospel, by works which no other (least of all Heathens) had ever done, and here we shew you by à remarkable Testimony, that Iſis, Ceres, and Hercules did before you came into the world, Works as great as yours. How shall we discern between the true and the counterfeit wonders? Or shall we say all are alike true, or all alike Counterfeit?

*If the Dr, as
he must,
account
them Fool-
ries, they are
pure Imperi-
tinences,*

19. On the other side, if the Dr Quotes not this remarkable Testimony to prove the truth of these Heathenish Miracles, but hold's all meer fictions. To what purpose hath his Testimony place here, or upon what account is it so remarkable? For, if we may truly suppose, that the Infidel Iſis never raised à dead man to life, or cured the blind and lame, it is senceles to infer from thence, that God by the Intercession of our Lady never wrought any such Miracles, when to Confront the Dr, we produce (as he desires) undeniable Evidence, and appeal not only to Miracles wrought at Loreto, which as you have heard he turn's off with jeers, but more over, lay before his eyes those two late Miracles most manifestly wrought upon Iohn Clement at Montaignu, and that other done at Zaragoza. I am forced often to remind the Reader of these Miracles, because its à shame to se how unworthily the Dr in his whole ensuing discourse (like

(like one that would fain bite, but dares not) here and there twitches at them, but at last vanquished with Evidence and quite dashed out of Countenance, Silently sits down and says nothing. Queen Christina of Sweden Proceeded otherwise, when being at Bruxells she heard much of the *Latter Miracle*, and treating with the Gouvernour there, Count Feunfaldana, asked whether his Excellence could procure her an Authentick Testimony of it from *Zaragoza*? The Count answered, he both could and would procure it from the Bishop of the place, and if need were from the Magistrate also, and, as I am certainly informed, did so. Whereupon the Queen received great satisfaction, prudently judging it a thing morally impossible, that the whole Kingdom of Spain (to say nothing of other Nations) should be led by the nose, to own that as a true Miracle, which our Dr must say was Leger demain, or a juggling trick of the Spanish Clergy, and of all those witnesses that swore to it. But of this subject more hereafter, when we examine, whether Heathens and Hereticks ever wrought true Miracles. And. 2. show, how the Miracles of Christ and the Church may be discerned from the Counterfeit Wonders of God's Enemies. Thus much concerning the Translation of the holy house at *Loreto*, judge, Courteous Reader, whether we have not found the Dr Shamefully out of the way, in his Pilgrimage thither, and we Shall, I assure you, find him as very a Straggler in his further Travels to *Compostella* &c. when we Prosecute the remainder of his Enquiry,

Miracles wrought by our B. Lady, most Certain,

And held as Certain the whole world over.

quiry, which, God willing, I intend to perform at better Leisure. In the mean, what you have now set down, may well give the D^r à Present entertainment, and 'tis more, I believe, than he Can answer.



